

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and L. J. TRINTERUD
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (*Divinity School,
Yale University*)

R. PIERCE BEAVER (*Missionary Re-
search Library*)

ROBERT GRANT (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

WINTHROP S. HUDSON (*Colgate-
Rochester Divinity School*)

SIDNEY E. MEAD (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

RAY C. PETRY (*Divinity School, Duke
University*)

MATTHEW SPINKA (*Hartford Theo-
logical Seminary*)

WILHELM PAUCK (*Union Theological
Seminary*)

VOL. XXIV

JUNE, 1955

No. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE ANABAPTISTS AND THE CIVIL AUTHORITIES OF STRASBOURG, 1525-1555

Robert Kreider

99

THE PACIFISM OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY ANA- BAPTISTS

Harold S. Bender

119

RECENT INTERPRETATIONS OF ANABAPTISM

Robert Friedmann

132

AMERICAN MISSIONARIES IN GREECE: 1820-1869

Theodore Saloutos

152

CONTENTS

DOCTORAL THESES 175

BOOK REVIEWS 181

WEST, WILLIAM GARRET: *Barton Warren Stone: Early American Advocate of Christian Unity*.W. E. Garrison

JOHNSTON, RUBY F.: *The Development of Negro Religion*David E. Swift

OULTON, JOHN ERNEST LEONARD AND CHADWICK, HENRY: *Alexandrian Christianity; Selected Translations of Clement and Origen with Introductions and Notes*.Albert C. Outler

KNOFF, ALFRED A.: *Medieval Political Ideas by Ewart Lewis*Jerome G. Kerwin

SCHMIDT, MARTIN: *John Wesley*David C. Shipley

WILSON, HOWARD MCKNIGHT, *The Tinkling Spring Headwater of Freedom, A Study of the Church and Her People, 1732-1952*Lefferts A. Loetscher

MILLMAN, THOMAS R.: *The Life of the Right Reverend, the Honourable Charles James Stewart*Gordon Barkwell

BURR, NELSON R.: *The Anglican Church in New Jersey*William Warren Sweet

BODO, JOHN R.: *The Protestant Clergy and Public Issues, 1812-1848*Sidney E. Mead

LYTTLE, CHARLES H.: *Freedom Moves West: a History of the Western Unitarian Conference, 1852-1952*Conrad Wright

THE ANABAPTISTS AND THE CIVIL AUTHORITIES OF STRASBOURG, 1525-1555*

ROBERT KREIDER, *Bluffton College*

Since the dawn of the Christian era the relationship between church and state has been one of the pivotal issues of western civilization. Men have offered a variety of answers to this problem. The much-persecuted Anabaptists of the 16th century presented one set of answers, radical for their age, which called for a decisive separation of the church from the state and complete freedom for the church to pursue its vocation in the world. The Anabaptists were a distressing annoyance to the civil authorities. This movement posed for the 16th century the acute problem: how should religious dissent be handled?

This paper is a study of how the civil authorities of Strasbourg viewed and acted toward the Anabaptists and, second, how the Anabaptists viewed, and acted toward, the civil authorities. The term "civil authorities" (*Obrigkeit*) is used in the broadest sense to include not only the duly elected magistrate but also all officials and institutions of government, even clergymen of the established church.

The period of this study begins with 1525, the year when the Anabaptist movement originated in Zurich, Switzerland, and closes with 1555, the year of the Religious Peace of Augsburg. The generation from 1525 to 1555 represents the flowering period of Swiss-South German Anabaptism.

During the age of the Reformation Strasbourg was a hostel of refuge and an organizing center for the Anabaptists. They called it the "City of Hope" and the "Refuge of Righteousness."¹ Strasbourg earned a wide reputation for tolerance in an age yet unprepared to respect nonconformity. The thriving commercial climate of the city nurtured a cosmopolitan spirit. This imperial city had, since a popular revolt in 1482, a kind of guild democracy which expressed itself in an intricate system of representative government."² Political responsibility was widely disseminated, citizenship being predicated on participation in one of the twenty established guilds of the city.³ Many contemporary observers praised the Strasbourg government. The comments of Sebastian Franck are typical: "As there is great freedom in this city, so is there indeed good policy and great unity of the citizenry."⁴ He commended the moderation of the city's judicial and penal

*Read before the American Society of Church History, Chicago, December 1953.

system and recalled a current saying; "He who is hanged elsewhere, is simply driven from Strasbourg by flogging."⁵

The Anabaptists experienced the tolerance of the city government in at least two concrete ways. Strasbourg had only the mildest censorship. Here the Anabaptists and other dissenters could publish their writings.⁶ The city may also have been attractive to the Anabaptists because of the completely organized municipal welfare program. Catherine Zell, wife of a leading clergyman, was the driving spirit of this program. She was known to have abounded in sympathy for the destitute Anabaptist refugees who appeared on the streets of Strasbourg.⁷

In Strasbourg with its deeply rooted traditions of humanism and lay piety the message of Luther was eagerly received. A circle of able Reformation preachers came to the fore: Mathias Zell, the first to preach Reformation doctrine, a well-loved and popular preacher; Wolfgang Capito and Casper Hedio, both respected scholars; and Martin Butzer, the resourceful, energetic church statesman and the tacitly acknowledged leader of the group. These men all had an openness to new theological ideas and, for the most part, an aversion to religious persecution. Strasbourg theology consequently, was assimilative of humanist, Lutheran, spiritualist, and sectarian elements.⁸ Strasbourg stood between Zwinglian Zurich and Lutheran Wittenberg. The preachers of Strasbourg, and in this respect particularly Butzer, conceived of Strasbourg as ordained to a mediating, unifying role between the Swiss and the Wittenbergers.⁹ A mediating center must maintain rapport with contending parties and must preserve an atmosphere of toleration.

Anabaptists flocked to the refuge of Strasbourg, not only because of the tolerant traditions of the city, but because they were confident that the Strasbourg clergy would better understand their faith than the men of Zurich or Wittenberg. In the early days of the movement the Anabaptists undoubtedly considered the Strasbourg Reformers to be "nigh unto the Kingdom." Both Butzer and Capito had misgivings about infant baptism.¹⁰ From the beginning Butzer conceived of the church not only as a church of the total community (*Volkskirche*) but also as a moralistic, disciplined brotherhood—the latter view akin to that of the Anabaptists.¹¹ The Strasbourg clergy, like the Anabaptists, conceived of the New Testament as normative for faith, ethics, and church polity. The Strasbourg clergy and the Anabaptists could communicate with each other because they shared so much common ground in religion.

Dissenters benefited in Strasbourg by the tensions between clergy and magistracy. The preachers repeatedly urged city council action

to inaugurate a reformed church organization, but the council preferred to move cautiously by a series of intermediate steps.¹² Not until February 20, 1529, did the Assembly of Three Hundred abolish the mass. Strasbourg thus became a Protestant city on the very eve of the Diet of Speyer.¹³ Pressed repeatedly by Butzer to enact laws against the sectarians, the council turned an indifferent ear. The magistracy was aroused to action only when certain sectarians seemed to be a menace to the public peace and order.¹⁴ However, when sectarian agitation quieted down, the city council returned to its deliberate, *laissez faire* ways. Apparently the city council was not prepared in the early years of the Reformation to face the full consequences of an established church in Strasbourg. This was dictated by at least three concerns: First, the council preferred to await the maturation of a unified public opinion. Throughout the twenties and into the thirties Catholics continued to be on the city councils. Those who remained loyal Catholics wanted no Reformed church order nor persecution of religious belief, fearing they would be the next victims. Council members were pleased not infrequently with the sectarian competition which held the Reformers in check.¹⁵ Second, the magistrate wished to hold the reins of final ecclesiastical authority and had no desire to yield this leadership to the clergy in a prematurely established church order.¹⁶ Third, the council wished in the early Reformation period to avoid provocative Protestant behavior. Realizing the serious consequences they faced in their relations with the emperor, the magistrates delayed decisions as long as possible.¹⁷ The city council preferred to accept the continuing annoyance of sectarianism rather than confront the full range of questions involved in a Reformed establishment.

Nonconformity in Strasbourg was diverse. An Anabaptist from Horb, Hans Frisch, declared at his trial in November 1534 that among the sectarians in Strasbourg were actually three different parties: the followers of Melchior Hoffman, Jacob Kautz, and Wilhelm Reublin.¹⁸ Hoffmann was the millennialist, Kautz the spiritualist, and Reublin the evangelical "Anabaptist." Our concern in this study is with those in the Reublin tradition—the evangelical Anabaptists, sometimes referred to as the "Swiss Brethren." They may be defined as that sector of the "left wing" of the Reformation who affirmed that discipleship of Christ was the regulative purpose of their lives and who covenanted together to form a gathered and disciplined church on the New Testament pattern.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE MOVEMENT

Beginning in the year 1526 Anabaptists began streaming into Strasbourg from Alsace and South Germany. The city records report many Anabaptists imprisoned in the "Tower" and then ordered

into exile.¹⁹ Among the early Anabaptist missionaries to arrive in Strasbourg was Jacob Gross, a travelling lay evangelist, who soon demonstrated remarkably effective leadership among the Anabaptists.²⁰ A furrier by trade, he had been expelled from his native Waldshut for refusal to give military service in behalf of the peasants at Zell.²¹ His successful evangelistic efforts were soon terminated by imprisonment. On August 9, 1526, he was brought to trial. Butzer was the spokesman for the Strasbourg authorities. Gross declared that he was not against the magistracy; in fact, he recognized that civil authorities were duty bound to punish the evil doer. Gross explained that he could not refuse to "stand watch, wear armor, and hold a pike in his hand." But, on command of God, he could kill no one.²² He complained that he had been cast into prison without explanation or hearing, but he added that he was prepared for this because a Christian's life is one of persecution and cross-bearing. He explained that if it should be God's will, he was ready to give his life for his faith, just as he had sacrificed all his property in Waldshut. Gross was placed in prison again following the trial, and when he continued to remain firm in his Anabaptist convictions, he was banished from the city.²³

The city council recorded in its protocol during 1526 that imprisonment and banishment were being accorded Anabaptists. The council declared that the Anabaptists had three teachings: (1) they respect no authority; (2) they respect no person; (3) they divide up their possessions among themselves.²⁴ Meanwhile, the Anabaptists remained unobtrusive, worshipping quietly in private homes. The clergy hoped that now Anabaptism was disappearing.²⁵ This, however, was only the quiet before the storm.

Hans Denck received a most favorable public response when he appeared in Strasbourg early in November 1526.²⁶ The Anabaptist movement again was prominently in the eye of the authorities. The clergy was anxiously aware that this Denck—a man of unblemished character, dignified in bearing, and highly articulate—was making a tremendous public impression.²⁷ Butzer was determined to curb Denck before his movement reached dangerous proportions.

A public disputation was called by the clergy for December 22, 1526. Butzer and Denck were the antagonists. Four hundred citizens attended the disputation, including two official delegates from the city council.²⁸ Butzer insisted to the city councillors present that Denck, as a known leader of the Anabaptists, was a threat to the welfare of the city and should be banished. Two days later the city council ordered Denck's exile.²⁹

Sebastian Franck in his *Chronica* states that Denck and his followers taught obedience to the magistracy in all things which were

not contrary to God, including the payment of interest and taxes.³⁰ Further, in accordance with Christ's will one is to suffer patiently rather than to resort to arms in one's defense.

Michael Sattler, author of the Anabaptist "Schleitheim Confession," remained in Strasbourg a few months in late 1526 as the house guest of Capito. Both Capito and Butzer had high respect and affection for Sattler.³¹ Sattler was prompted to depart voluntarily from the city in early 1527 as a protest against the city's banishment of Hans Denck and the imprisonment of other coreligionists. These concerns he expressed in his farewell letter to Capito and Butzer in which he addressed the two Reformers as "dear brothers in God."³² Sattler presents in this letter, in a series of sharp contrasts, the conflict between the church and the world. The Kingdom of Christ is not of this world, rather the world is in conflict with His Kingdom. Christ is the prince of the spirit; Satan is the prince of this world. The faithful are selected out of this world; therefore they are estranged from the world. They rest their trust completely in their Father in Heaven, hence have no need for visible and earthly armor. Their citizenship is in heaven and not on earth. In summation, Christ and Belial have nothing in common. He explains to his two friends that for reasons of conscience he must leave the city. Finally, he counsels Butzer and Capito neither to coerce nor to employ legal measures against those in religious error. At the most one may warn and then avoid those in error. He urges that mercy be shown toward those imprisoned. A few months after Sattler departed from Strasbourg he was burned at the stake in Rottenburg.

Butzer and Capito were impressed with Sattler. Butzer called him "a dear friend of God" and "a martyr of Christ."³³ When Capito learned in May 1527 of the execution of Sattler, he addressed a letter to the city council of Horb, where many of Sattler's brothers in the faith were imprisoned.³⁴ He granted that Sattler and his followers erred in their views on baptism and in their refusal to serve as magistrates, to take the oath, and to fight in defense against the enemy. Admitting these errors, they were nonetheless "wonderful witnesses to the truth." Capito begged the council of Horb not to punish these followers of Sattler because in the major principles of faith they did not err. Counsel with them in a friendly manner, he urged, and on the lesser points give time for God's grace to work. He added that some illnesses of the soul cannot be healed immediately.

Capito reported hopefully to Zwingli in February 1527 that the Anabaptists, although not eliminated, were no longer so dangerous.³⁵ Although the leading personalities had departed from Strasbourg, the Anabaptists nonetheless continued to increase. This Capito sadly

admitted to Zwingli in a letter of April 8, 1527.³⁶ Capito charged that the Anabaptists, who were becoming more numerous and bold in public, were "not only opposing infant baptism, the bearing of weapons, and the office of the magistracy as unchristian," but also striving against Scripture.

Observing the growing strength of Anabaptism and the marked decrease in church attendance, the clergy urged the city council to act. The council issued a mandate in 1527, warning every man "to beware of such erroneous, anti-Scriptural misleading" as the Anabaptists introduced, and forbidding the populace to give shelter and food to Anabaptists and their associates.³⁷ Violators of this ordinance were threatened with severe fines. The council explained in the mandate that this action against the Anabaptists was justified because they split and did injury to a unified, Christian community. The authorities, however, had reluctantly promulgated this legislation and so enforced it only half-heartedly.³⁸ This, nevertheless, marks the beginning of more repressive policies against dissent.

Martin Butzer, with his deep sense of church and community order, was beginning to assume as a personal obligation the task of combating sectarian teaching and Anabaptist influence among the people. In July 1527 he published in behalf of the Strasbourg clergy a twenty-four page tract, *Getreue Warnung (A Faithful Warning)*, written expressly to refute the view of Jacob Kautz of Worms, Hans Denck, and "other Anabaptists."³⁹ Four months later the Anabaptists were still increasing daily. Capito reported, "Even the best hearts become infected with this epidemic."⁴⁰ He said that if questioned as to their opinions, these people simply remained silent. The following year Butzer lamented that conditions in Strasbourg were deplorable: "Vice has taken not a few; besides this evil, the Anabaptists make most of us waver."⁴¹ It was undoubtedly disturbing to Butzer to observe that a number of persons from the patrician classes were attracted to the Anabaptist brotherhood. Among these were the high public official Lukas Hackfurt, a city almoner, and Fridolin Meyer, a notary public.⁴² It would be interesting to know whether those who became Anabaptists while holding public office continued in their governmental positions or resigned their offices. The available records provide no information.

At the beginning of each year the citizens of Strasbourg were required to assemble together to take the oath of allegiance to the city constitution. The Anabaptists had qualms of conscience about taking this oath. This prompted Capito to write a public letter to the city *Ammeister* explaining that Jesus' command, "swear not at all," was directed against the Pharisees and that the oath, given in the

fear of God, is the highest form of honor to God.⁴³ Butzer reports that thereupon all of the Anabaptists took the oath.⁴⁴ This disturbed Butzer because heretofore Anabaptists had been publicly identifiable because of their refusal to take the oath. Now he feared the Anabaptists would be going underground. It is probable that not all of the Anabaptists renounced their objections to the oath, since one of their leading members, Fridolin Meyer, published later that year a four-page pamphlet listing the Biblical reasons for refusing to swear the civic oath.⁴⁵

THE RAPID GROWTH OF THE MOVEMENT

Anabaptist leaders from Switzerland and South Germany arrived during 1528 to give the movement new strength. Wilhelm Reublin, one of the early Swiss Anabaptists, came to Strasbourg during the summer. Pilgram Marpeck, who was soon to become the leading spokesman of the Strasbourg Anabaptists, appeared in 1528. The clergy was eager to engage in public debate with Wilhelm Reublin and Jacob Kautz, a spiritualist-Anabaptist recently exiled from Worms. The city council, however, refused to grant approval.⁴⁶ Repeatedly the clergy petitioned for a public disputation and as often the council refused. The clergy were alarmed over the mounting strength of Anabaptism. They were confident that they could thoroughly discredit the movement in public debate. The council was anxious to prevent the Anabaptist issue from taking a prominent place in the public eye because it was known that Charles V had issued on January 4, 1528, an edict demanding the execution of Anabaptists throughout the Empire. Early in 1529 Reublin attempted to escape from his prison but was seized by the watchman and returned to the tower.⁴⁷ Suffering from illness and lameness, Reublin was finally released from prison and banished forever from the city and the bishopric of Strasbourg. Soon thereafter, however, he was apprehended while attending an Anabaptist meeting in a private home. Again he was banished with the added threat that if he should return again he would be drowned.⁴⁸ Kautz was also exiled from the city.

Beginning in the year 1529 came a period of rapid expansion of Anabaptism in Strasbourg. Harried from place to place, the Anabaptists continued to flock to Strasbourg regardless of the city mandate of July 1527. When Augsburg banished its flourishing Anabaptist community in October 1528, more than a hundred of these exiles fled to Strasbourg.⁴⁹ The court records report that on a certain Wednesday early in the year a number of Anabaptists were apprehended while meeting in the private homes of three leading citizens.⁵⁰ The record speaks of the Anabaptists "plotting" in one of the homes. Sev-

eral Anabaptists were subjected to torture but persisted in denying the charges that they had their wives in common. In the spring of 1529 forty-four Anabaptists were imprisoned in the Wilhelm's Tower alone.⁵¹ By this time the Anabaptists had strong leadership in the person of Pilgram Marpeck. Printers of the city were hesitant to publish books against the Anabaptists, because they found such limited sale.⁵² The clergy observed that fewer infants were being brought to the church for baptism. Urged by the clergy to stiffen its policy against the Anabaptists, the city council renewed on September 24, 1530, the earlier mandate of 1527.⁵³ It, however, was enforced as laxly as before. Throughout 1529 and 1530 the Anabaptists multiplied while the clergy and the magistrates were preoccupied with other concerns.⁵⁴ Those were the months of the Diet of Speyer, the Colloquy of Marburg, and the Diet of Augsburg. Butzer and Capito did find time in 1530 to request the right to hold a disputation with the Anabaptists, but the city council abruptly refused this request. The council explained that the problem was adequately covered by two mandates which were still fully operative.⁵⁵

In 1531 Butzer again devoted his energies to combating the Anabaptists. Partially because of the Anabaptist competition, Butzer strove to effect a closer organization of the Protestant church. A problem to Butzer was the city council itself. Ever since the mass had been abolished in 1529, the council jealously guarded its prerogatives as supreme authority for church affairs. On the insistence of Butzer, however, the magistrates established on October 30, 1531, a college of church wardens (*Kirchspielpfleger*) for the supervision of church life.⁵⁶ The city council cooperated in this program with a notable lack of enthusiasm. The turning point in Butzer's struggle against the Anabaptists came in December 1531 when the council decreed the banishment of the leader of the Anabaptist community, Pilgram Marpeck. Also of significance was Butzer's success in winning his colleague Capito to the viewpoint that the Anabaptists must be suppressed. In November 1532 Butzer could write to his friend Musculus: "Capito was in the beginning too mild against the sects; now he is decisive and sharp enough."⁵⁷ Love for the unity of the church was the theme which converted Capito to a loyalty to the established church pattern. Capito's views had so changed by 1535 that he denounced the principle of freedom of religion and asserted that it was the foremost duty of the civil authorities to regulate matters of faith for the territorial community.⁵⁸

The Anabaptists were in their most vigorous stage of development in Strasbourg during the years from 1528 to 1532 when Pilgram Marpeck lived in the city. Marpeck, who was a refugee from the

Tyrol and a mining engineer by profession, found employment with the city as an engineer.⁵⁹ Gradually he rose to prominence in the Anabaptist congregation, succeeding Wilhelm Reublin as leader.⁶⁰ By 1531 Martin Butzer took anxious note of the Anabaptists, singling out Marpeck as his most formidable opponent. On August 17, 1531, he wrote to Margaret Blaurer, a sister of the Reformer Ambrosius Blaurer, to warn her of Marpeck: "Concerning Pilgram, know that he is nothing but a stubborn heretic."⁶¹ He found Marpeck "unduly strict." Margaret Blaurer apparently was difficult to convince for Butzer felt compelled to write four letters to her concerning Marpeck. He charged Marpeck with heresy. Heresy, he writes, is a "disease of the flesh which presumes to adopt a better doctrine of life (only in appearance) than that of the common church's divine practice, and therefore separates from the church and is identified with a particular faction and sect." He continued: "They [the Anabaptists] want to be better than other people but in love they are grossly lacking. . . . Therefore, look out! . . . I have no doubt, however, but that there are dear children of God among these people."⁶² Finally in a letter of October 23, 1531, Butzer predicted civil action against Marpeck: "Pilgram will not desist from baptizing and persuading people that swearing and defense by force are not right; I fear he will be exiled."⁶³ His "fears" were promptly realized.

Meanwhile Marpeck had run afoul of the Strasbourg censors. He had written two booklets on the doctrines of the Anabaptists. The two censors declared that Marpeck's booklets could not be sold openly.⁶⁴

The lenient city council delayed action against Marpeck, but finally in 1531 ordered his imprisonment. Capito, as his custom was, visited him in prison, but the conference was without result.⁶⁵ On December 9, 1531 Marpeck and Butzer were ordered to appear before the city council.⁶⁶ Marpeck declared at the outset of the hearing that this matter of faith stood under no human judgment. He explained that he appeared before the council in order to speak to all Christians. He begged that the councilors be completely impartial among those who were papists, evangelicals, and Anabaptists. Marpeck explained how his brethren had been imprisoned, undoubtedly, through the complaints of the clergy and how he was punished simply for giving them pastoral care.

Marpeck made three charges against the clergy, the principal one being that they preach under the protection of the magistrates and not freely under the cross of Christ. Butzer, as spokesman for the clergy, asserted in response that the clergy had long wanted to have a disputation with Marpeck and others to prevent disunion. When Butzer added that the clergy had appealed to the council in the acceptable

manner, Marpeck cried out: "He who seeks the protection and cover of the creature, let him be accursed." The government is only for those who are under the law. He who will not permit himself to be informed by the Word, belongs to the civil authority. Here he affirmed categorically the necessity of the separation of church and state. He also apparently denied that the government had any functional value for the true Christian.

Two more disputations followed. Marpeck was permitted by the *Ammeister* to bring two assistants with him to the debate on December 11, 1531, providing they would "keep their mouths shut when they did not know anything."⁸⁷ The council, on December 18, 1531, exiled Marpeck from the city and along with him all the Anabaptist elders, especially those who were not natives of Strasbourg.⁸⁸ The authorities stated that they would gladly permit Marpeck to remain in Strasbourg if he would simply withdraw his separatist views and such other principles as nonresistance and his objection to the oath. In a letter the following day to the council Marpeck expressed his obedience to their decision. He added, however, that if the Spirit of God should lead him back to Strasbourg sometime in the future, he could do no other but respond to this leading. He requested three or four weeks of time to dispose of some household furniture and reminded them of an unpaid bill for one of his engineering projects. Marpeck managed to secure two extensions of his stay, permitting him time to engage in a third disputation with Butzer on January 18, 1532.⁸⁹ By this time Butzer had become so exasperated with the persistent Marpeck that he complained in a letter to Ambrosius Blaurer: "The affair of these Anabaptists here is endless."⁹⁰

Finally there was an exchange of writings between Marpeck and Butzer on infant baptism and other controversial points. One of Marpeck's concluding acts in Strasbourg was to compose a confession of faith which Butzer called a "wordy volume."⁹¹ Marpeck wrote in his confession that in the Kingdom of Christ there is no coercion, but rather a voluntary spirit.⁹² Further, no external force may be employed in the Kingdom of Christ.

In a farewell letter to the council Marpeck stated that it was not a small gift of grace from God that the city had not shed blood in matters of faith.⁹³ He pleaded that they should have concern for the persecuted souls who have no place of safety in the whole world and who flee to Strasbourg. He added that he would always be grateful to God for their good deeds to him. Marpeck probably departed from the city in February, 1532. The Anabaptists in Strasbourg had lost the last of their great leaders.

THE DECLINE OF THE MOVEMENT

Martin Butzer sought not only more stringent measures against the separatists, but he worked persistently to establish a church order for Strasbourg. These ambitions were partially realized in June 1533, when the first Strasbourg Synod adopted a confession of faith known as the "Sixteen Articles."⁷⁴ These articles, originally drafted by Butzer, bear evidence of having been formulated in conscious awareness of the Anabaptist opposition. The footnotes often refer to Anabaptist teachings.⁷⁵ The city council, however, was slow to implement the results of the synod. The magistracy especially balked at the thought of a church-wide discipline.⁷⁶ No doubt the council was impelled to act because sectarian excitement had again flared up in the city. Melchior Hoffman, the millennialist prophet, had returned to Strasbourg in 1533 and, although soon imprisoned, was the central figure in a tremendous outcropping of apocalyptic agitation.⁷⁷ The council published a mandate on March 3, 1534, adopting the Sixteen Articles and ordering that no doctrine contrary to the Augsburg Confession would be tolerated in the city thereafter.⁷⁸ The council further decreed that foreigners who were Anabaptists were to be imprisoned or banished under threat of death. Citizens were warned to conform to the Strasbourg doctrine and if they did not do so they, with wife and child, would be exiled within fourteen days and forbidden to return under penalty of death. A commission on Anabaptist affairs, called *Täuferherrschaft*, was established to enforce the mandate with rigor and was charged with the duty of apprehending and sentencing Anabaptists found in Strasbourg.⁷⁹

The Synod of 1533, together with the Mandate of March 3, 1534, marked a decisive defeat for the movement. The number of Anabaptists in this city of 25,000 was estimated at this time to have been about two thousand.⁸⁰ Following the promulgation of the new mandate, hundreds fled Strasbourg into the surrounding Alsatian countryside. Some found refuge with the Anabaptists in Moravia.⁸¹ As persecution was intensified the Anabaptists held more of their meetings in neighboring forests and so gained the name of the *Waldkirche*—the forest church.⁸² After 1532 no leading personalities were associated with the movement in Strasbourg. The movement had been effectively curbed. One observes that Butzer no longer concerned himself with the threat of the Anabaptists in his correspondence and in his petitions to the city council. He had conquered, and was weary of it all. To Blaurer he wrote: "The sects weaken and enervate my spirit."⁸³

Out of this period comes a remarkable statement of the Anabaptist concern for the principle of religious liberty. This was a letter which

a refugee brother in Moravia, Kilian Aurbacher, wrote to Martin Butzer in 1534:⁸⁴

... it is never right to compel one in matters of faith, whatever he may believe, be he Jew or Turk. Even if one does not believe uprightly nor wants to have the right understanding of salvation, . . . he shall bear his guilt; no one will stand for him in the Judgment. . . . And thus we, who conduct ourselves according to the example of Christ and the apostles and proclaim the Gospel according to the Grace that He has entrusted to us, compel no one. But he who is willing and ready is invited to follow Him, as Luke reports in Acts. This then is an open truth, that Christ's people are a free, unforced and uncompelled people, who receive Christ with desire and a willing heart; of this the Scriptures testify.

The council stiffened its legal policy in 1535 by issuing a "mandate against the Anabaptists," a mandate especially addressed to the citizens of the Strasbourg countryside.⁸⁵ No one was permitted to give food, housing, or refuge to any Anabaptist and one was to report immediately to the local official any person suspected of being an Anabaptist. The council declared obligatory the baptism of all infants within six weeks of birth. Parents failing to bring their children for baptism were to be severely punished. The mandate further complained of the indifference of the people to the church and ordered the citizens to attend the stated services under penalty of fine.

Landgrave Philip of Hesse in 1536 invited a number of ecclesiastical and governmental authorities to give him counsel as how best to handle the Anabaptists. The Strasbourg city council referred this request to the theologians, who wrote their opinion on August 5, 1536.⁸⁶ They advised that the Anabaptists should neither be exiled nor imprisoned, but preferably employed in useful work in so far as they would not confuse or lead anyone astray. Now that the Anabaptist danger in Strasbourg was past, the theologians were prepared to advise other governments to be magnanimous.

The Strasbourg city council was by no means so benevolent. On March 23, 1538, the city council issued a new mandate with four harsh provisions:⁸⁷ (1) All Anabaptists were to be banished. (2) In case one of those exiled returned, he was to be imprisoned for four weeks, with only bread and water, and then again exiled. (3) If an Anabaptist returned a second time, he would be punished by having his fingers cut off or by placing him in neck irons and branding his cheek. (4) If he returned a third time, he would be executed by drowning. The mandate recognized that the Anabaptists were folk of various points of view, and that among them were many pious people. Mixed among them, however, were those "cunning people" who would destroy the traditional government and would establish their own rule in conflict with God's order as was to be witnessed at Münster. The mandate contained traditional charges against the Anabaptists: (1) If they were

permitted a free and unhindered development, they would gain the upper hand. (2) They would bring to ruin the heritage of good government in Strasbourg. (3) One may expect from them a repetition of the disturbances experienced during the peasants' revolt or they may destroy the city as they did in Münster. (4) They divided and corrupted the unity of the church. This was the first Strasbourg mandate concerning the Anabaptists which cited Münster as a perilous warning against toleration of the movement. This was also the first mandate of the city which acknowledged that it was issued in conformity with the imperial laws against the Anabaptists. Finally, the city council explained in the mandate that these stern measures were not designated to control the inner faith of the individual but to preserve according to divine command the order of government, the unity of the church, and the public welfare. In an accompanying mandate the city authorities announced a special oath, always referred to as the "*Artikel*," which was to be required of all residents of Strasbourg who were not citizens.⁸⁸ Those who took this oath thereby acknowledged obedience to the mandate of 1538.

On April 9, 1540, the Strasbourg council issued another mandate against the Anabaptists in which it underscored the provisions of previous edicts.⁸⁹ Those refusing to take the oath (the *Artikel*) were threatened with the loss of life and limb and those granting hospitality to Anabaptists were threatened with corporal punishment and the loss of property. The mandate contained the remark that from time to time large numbers of Anabaptists had been known to meet together in uncustomary places such as out in the fields. This mandate is the last Strasbourg edict known to have been directed against the movement.

The Strasbourg clergy and civil authorities had earned the reputation of having handled successfully the Anabaptist problem. Bern, Zweibrücken, Hesse and other cities had solicited counsel from Strasbourg. In 1546 Count Philip IV of Hanau-Lichtenberg sought Butzer's advice on how to treat the Anabaptists.⁹⁰ Butzer, who could draw upon twenty years of experience with the problem, advised against punishment, which he said would only be a disservice to one's neighbors. Butzer suggested that the sectarians should be brought together at some place where they could earn their own bread and where they would disturb no one. On another occasion in 1546 Butzer declared that it was an "Anabaptist error that the magistrate should tolerate the religion of an individual, whatever he believed and taught, if he did not disturb the external, political peace."⁹¹ Religious liberty was to Butzer a grave error.

Many Anabaptists continued to live in Strasbourg. In March

1540 officers surprised an Anabaptist meeting and arrested thirty-nine persons, while an equal number escaped.⁹² In the city records are reports based on rumor of meetings in the nearby countryside and forests where the attendance numbered one hundred to three hundred and fifty and one time six hundred.⁹³ The Anabaptist congregation in Strasbourg numbered approximately one hundred in 1556.⁹⁴

Anabaptist missionaries were active from the beginning in the towns and countryside of Alsace. As the brethren were forced to leave Strasbourg many found refuge in these rural districts. Only a few fragmentary records remain concerning the Anabaptist movement in Alsace. A woman, who testified under torture at Colmar, related how thirty-six had assembled one night in a forest near Schlettstadt.⁹⁵ One of their number read Scripture and spoke for three hours. They then all knelt and prayed for a quarter of an hour for all authorities and for their persecutors. After a common meal, one of them admonished those who were not yet baptized to live a quiet Christian life. The city council of Colmar received a report in 1534 that three hundred Anabaptists were living in the area to the southeast toward Egisheim.⁹⁶ The pastor of Rosheim reported in 1538 that twenty-five "wild animals" (Anabaptists) had been imprisoned near Epfig and that three hundred had assembled in a forest.⁹⁷ At Eastertime in 1540 sixty-nine Anabaptists were arrested at one time near Illkirch.⁹⁸ The most harsh persecution reigned in the Austrian territories in Alsace. Ensisheim in southern Alsace was the seat of the Austrian government. Here in the name of the King Ferdinand I was issued on May 24, 1529, a mandate against the Anabaptists applicable to his possessions in Alsace. The Anabaptists were to be ferreted out and punished according to the dictates of the imperial mandate issued the previous month in Speyer.⁹⁹ This edict was reaffirmed with even more severely worded mandates on May 26, 1535, and again on December 10, 1554.¹⁰⁰ Sebastian Franck recorded that the Austrians executed six hundred Anabaptists at Ensisheim during the early 1530's.¹⁰¹

Strasbourg served for generations as a center of Anabaptist activity and conferences. There must have been a substantial Anabaptist community to be able to accommodate these conference guests in the homes of the brethren. Such conferences were held in 1555, 1557, and 1568. The conference of 1568 resulted in the adoption of a twenty-three article discipline, the only joint statement, except the Schleithem Confession of 1527, preserved by the Swiss-South German Anabaptists from this period.¹⁰² It is reasonable to assume that this discipline is indicative of the kind of Anabaptism found in Strasbourg at mid-century. One sees a movement grown increasingly quietistic, and which has structuralized itself in moralistic and cultural terms. The final

article counsels the brotherhood on how to remain nonresistant and yet assume one's community responsibilities: "If a brother is to watch or guard in village, field, wood, or forest, he may hire someone, if it is for the best, or he himself may guard but not to anyone's harm, and he may not carry any weapon such as a spear and the like."

CONCLUSION

Throughout the Reformation period no other city experienced such a continuous encounter between the Reformed and Anabaptist points of view as Strasbourg. Here for a few years in an environment of comparative freedom Anabaptism was permitted to grow until a substantial minority of the population was committed to the movement. With the possible exception of St. Gall and Augsburg, no urban community responded so favorably to Anabaptism as Strasbourg. In the city both Reformed and Anabaptist teaching had to be articulated in immediate awareness of the opposing position. The Anabaptists were an irritant in the body politic. Their very presence required the authorities to ponder the problem of how nonconformity and variety in religious expression were to be handled in the community.

The Strasbourg Anabaptists viewed the Christian's relationship to the civil authorities in essentially the same way as their Swiss brethren. A series of tenets derive from their conception of a radical Christian discipleship. First, the Anabaptists acknowledged the primacy of the claims of God over the claims of government. Second, they affirmed that the magistracy is ordained of God to punish the evil and protect the good. They did not fully clarify their viewpoint, however, as to whether the magistracy had functional value for earnest Christians. All were agreed that the magistracy was essential for non-Christians. Third, they agreed unanimously that the Christian owes obedience to the civil authorities in so far as the prior claims of God are not violated in those duties. Fourth, the Anabaptists were convinced that a Christian could not occupy the office of the magistrate. They did not consider that the office *per se* was evil. They felt that they could not use methods commonly associated with the office. They saw themselves, therefore, disqualified from office holding. Some who became Anabaptists, however, appear to have continued, at least for a while, as local officials of government. Fifth, they were convinced that a government-established church violated the precepts of Scripture. They advocated the disestablishment of the state church (i.e., separation of church and state). Here one may observe that the Anabaptists of Strasbourg distinguished themselves with several notable affirmations concerning religious freedom. Sixth, they were devoted believers in nonresistance. With the possible exception of one apologist for noncombatant service, they renounced all military service. Seventh,

they refused to swear the civil oath on the grounds of Christ's admonition: "Let your communication be Yea, yea; Nay, nay." Eighth, they believed that the New Testament dictated that no Christian should bring suit in a court of law. Ninth, they refused in many ways to conform themselves to hallowed civic mores. Tenth, they were persuaded that when moved of the spirit they should testify fearlessly to those in authority concerning the great issues of faith and morality.

What distinguished the Anabaptist statements of position in Strasbourg was not so much what was said, but how and when and where it was said. The brethren in Strasbourg in the first decade of the movement were uninhibited in their eagerness to witness. They petitioned that public disputations be held. They wrote letters to the magistracy. They conferred endlessly with councilmen and clergy. Early Anabaptism in Strasbourg was of a particularly vigorous strain. However, after the movement was shorn of its ablest leaders and exhausted by several decades of harassment, Anabaptism settled into a respectable quietude. They had become the quiet in the land—*Die Stillen im Lande*.

At first appearance it seems most strange that these folk, whom Sebastian Franck declared were "drawing to themselves many sincere souls who had a zeal for God," were singled out by the civil authorities for the fate of imprisonment, torture, and banishment. Why were the Anabaptists persecuted? A variety of reasons were advanced by the authorities. One must distinguish between the publicly avowed reasons for persecution and those which were probably the real ones. The essential reasons were few in number. First, the authorities believed that the Anabaptists were dismembering the church, the very body of Christ, and thus shattering the ideal of a unified civil and religious community. The Strasbourg authorities were unprepared to countenance a pluralistic society. This concern for complete civic and religious solidarity was heightened by an acute anxiety for the safety of this Reformation stronghold in a hostile world of Roman Catholicism. Second, the authorities feared that the Anabaptists were undermining the authority and prestige of the magistracy. Anabaptists refused to bear arms. They challenged the accepted belief that a Christian should hold public office. They declined to swear the oath—the sacred symbol of community loyalty. Moreover, the Anabaptists refused so frequently to conform to the commands of the government that the magistrates feared that this civil disobedience would produce an epidemic of contempt for governmental authority. Third, they feared the missionary expansionism of the movement. They feared what might happen if a large segment of the community became Anabaptists—the effects upon the military establishment, the staffing of the magis-

tracy, the perpetuation of tradition-honored civic customs, the launching of a new Reformed state church order. Fourth, the authorities could not erase from their minds a gnawing anxiety that this peaceful-appearing movement harbored revolutionary potentialities which might break forth with savage violence at some future time. This evil of persecution was the only way to prevent, they thought, a greater future evil. Fifth, the authorities were deeply annoyed by the boldness and forthrightness (they called it "insolence") with which the Anabaptists challenged their political superiors.

The later mandates of Strasbourg, which were drafted in acknowledged conformity with imperial law, were as severe as found in the penal legislation of most other cities: neck irons, branding of cheeks, drowning, imprisonment on diets of bread and water, banishment, and so on. Despite the rigorous provisions of these mandates, there is no record that anyone was executed in Strasbourg for reasons of Anabaptist affiliation.¹⁰³ The Strasbourg authorities in fact prided themselves on the moderation of their treatment of Anabaptist dissent. In its magnanimous moments the Strasbourg government affirmed its readiness to permit Anabaptists to live in the community providing they did not proselyte nor disturb the public peace.

In sharp contrast to the moderation of Strasbourg policy was the program of persecution which King Ferdinand I carried through with ruthless efficiency in the neighboring Austrian territory of Alsace. Here Anabaptists by the hundreds were executed.

One may pose the question: What was the most effective means employed in counteracting the movement? Here one must examine the methods utilized by the state clergy—the key instrumentality of the government in combatting Anabaptism. The clergy was not unified in its strategy. One approach was the gentle pastoral counseling method of Matthias Zell and Wolfgang Capito. Catherine Zell, the widow of the Reformer, addressed a letter in 1550 to the Strasbourg clergy protesting the persecution of the separatists:

The poor Anabaptists about whom you are so enraged, and [against whom you] incite the government, as a hunter sets his dogs on wild pigs and rabbits—they [the Anabaptists] nevertheless zealously confess Christ with us, and thus you persecute Christ in them. Yea many of them have confessed Him notwithstanding exile, imprisonment and execution by fire and water. Do you realize that we, in doctrine and life, give them cause for separation? The government should punish those that do wrong, but should not use force in matters of faith, as you are advising. . . . Strasbourg, the Lord be praised, is yet giving an example of mercy, sympathy and hospitality for the homeless fugitives, and harbors today many a poor Christian professor whom you would desire to be driven out. Such things Matthias Zell never approved. . . . He never consented to persecution, and at a time when the preachers urged the government to exile the Anabaptists he, with a sad heart and great

earnestness, said publicly from the pulpit and in the convention of the ministers: "I call God, heaven and earth to witness at that day that I am innocent of the oppression and banishment of these poor people."¹⁰⁴

Despite the winsomeness of their spirits, Capito and Zell appear to have won very few sectarians to the established church by the ways of kindness. On the contrary Capito himself was perilously near to becoming a spiritualist-separatist.

Another approach was that of Martin Butzer, who was resourceful enough to employ a variety of methods. He was less of a pastoral counselor than Capito. He delighted in the method of public disputation in which he was a master. One sees only a few isolated cases, however, in which the clergy convinced an opponent in public debate. Anabaptists and Reformers alike coveted the opportunity of debating their respective cases before the public or the city council. One suspects that the effectiveness of this method of public persuasion was overrated by both the clergy and the Anabaptists. The city council was sufficiently skeptical of their value that it frequently refused to grant permission for such public disputations.

As Martin Butzer struggled against the spread of Anabaptism and wrestled with the problems of a church administrator in the light of New Testament norms, he became convinced that a disciplined, well-ordered, moralistic church community was one of the best answers to the clamoring of the separatists.¹⁰⁵ His plan was to institute in cooperation with the city council a rigorous church discipline.¹⁰⁶ This, however, he could never fully implement in Strasbourg because of the opposition of the city council and some of the preachers. Blocked by the magistracy in these plans, Butzer sought to establish within the state church a smaller voluntary fellowship of disciplined, earnest Christians—a *Christliche Gemeinschaft*—a precursor of the pietist *ecclesiola in ecclesia*.¹⁰⁷

By far the most effective means advocated by Butzer in checking Anabaptist growth was coercion. Butzer emphasized that coercion had to be applied continuously and systematically to be effective. He was never known to have advocated the execution of Anabaptists. To him imprisonment and banishment were sufficient instruments for the purpose of containing and turning back the movement. This became the accepted policy of the Strasbourg government.

One may conclude that the most effective means found in Strasbourg to combat Anabaptism was systematic, continuous coercion and the example of a vigorous, disciplined church. The city authorities were shrewd in singling out the Anabaptist leaders for the severest punishment, thus blocking the movement at its source. The *modus vivendi* worked out by the magistracy and clergy was to contain the

movement by coercive devices and then to allow Anabaptists to exist in the community if they did not proselyte nor disturb the public peace.

1. Ulrich Crämer, *Die Verfassung und Verwaltung Strassburgs von der Reformationszeit bis zum Fall der Reichsstadt* (Frankfurt a.M.: Elsass-Lothringen Institut, 1931), p. 196.
2. Julius Rathgeber, *Strassburg im sechszehnten Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1871), pp. 6-7.
3. Werner Bellardi, *Die Geschichte der "Christlichen Gemeinschaft" in Strassburg (1546-1550)*, Vol. XVIII of *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte* (Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1934), p. 10.
4. Camill Gerbert, *Geschichte der Strassburger Sektenbewegung zur Zeit der Reformation* (Strasbourg: Heitz und Mündel, 1889), p. xii.
5. *Ibid.*, p. x.
6. Adolf Baum, *Magistrat und Reformation in Strassburg bis 1529* (Strasbourg: J. H. Ed. Heitz, 1887), pp. 7-8.
7. Gerbert, *op. cit.*, pp. viii-ix.
8. Gustav Anrich, "Strassburg und die Calvinische Kirchenverfassung," *Reden bei der Rektoratsübergabe am 3. Mai 1928 im Festsaal der Universität*, No. 25 of *University of Tübingen* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1928), p. 18.
9. Cf. Wilhelm Pauk, *The Heritage of the Reformation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1950), p. 89.
10. John Horsch, *Infant Baptism* (Scottsdale, Pa.: published by author, 1917), pp. 24-26, 94-95.
11. Gustav Anrich, *Martin Bucer* (Strasbourg: Karl J. Trübner, 1914), p. 37.
12. Baum, *op. cit.*, pp. 94-96.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 186-87.
14. Crämer, *op. cit.*, p. 186.
15. Johann W. Baum, *Capito und Butzer* (Elberfeld: R. L. Friderichs, 1860), p. 371.
16. For a discussion of the prolonged resistance of the magistracy to the introduction of church discipline see Bellardi, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-25.
17. For an account of Jacob Sturm's unsuccessful effort to postpone the abolition of the mass in Strasbourg until after the Diet of Speyer see Adolf Baum, *op. cit.*, pp. 186-87.
18. Timoth. Wilh. Röhrich, "Zur Geschichte der strassburgischen Wiedertäufer in den Jahren 1527 bis 1543," *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, XXX (1860), p. 79.
19. C. A. Cornelius, *Die Wiedertaufe*, Vol. II of *Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufbruchs* (Leipzig: T. D. Weigel, 1860), II, 273.
20. Gerbert, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
21. Zürich, Vol. I of *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz*, eds. Leonhard von Muralt and Walter Schmid (Zürich: S. Hirzel, 1952), No. 107.
22. Gerbert, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
24. Cornelius, *op. cit.*, II, 273.
25. Capito to Zwingli, Strasbourg, September 26, 1526, *Huldreich Zwinglis sämtliche Werke*, ed. E. Egli et al., VIII (Vol. XCX of *Corpus Reformatorum* [Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1936]), 725 (hereafter cited as *ZW* with the volume number of the *Werke* rather than of the *Corpus Reformatorum*).
26. Capito to Zwingli, Strasbourg, December 10, 1526, *ZW*, VIII, 800, cf. Butzer to Farel, Strasbourg, in A. L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des Reformateurs* (Geneva: H. Georg, 1878), I, 467.
27. Capito to Zwingli, Strasbourg, December 26, 1526, *ZW*, VIII, 819-20.
28. Christian Neff, "Martin Butzer," *Mennonitisches Lexikon* (ML), eds. Christian Hege and Christian Neff (Frankfurt am Main and Weierhof [Pfalz], 1913-) I, 309.
29. Capito to Zwingli, Strasbourg, December 26, 1526, *ZW*, VIII, 820.
30. Sebastian Franck, "Chronica der Römischen Kätzer," Part 3 of *Chronica, Zeytbuch und Geschichtsbibel* (Strasbourg: Balthasar Beck, 1531), p. cccclxix.
31. A. Hulshof, *Geschiedenis van de Doopsgezinden te Straatsburg van 1525 tot 1557* (Amsterdam: J. Clausen, 1905), pp. 66-67.
32. Copy of the letter in Röhrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-32.
33. Neff, "Butzer," *ML*, I, 309.
34. An abridged copy of Capito's letter is to be found in Baum, *Capito und Butzer*, pp. 373-75.
35. Capito to Zwingli, Strasbourg, February 28, 1527, *ZW*, IX, 60.
36. Capito to Zwingli, Strasbourg, April 8, 1527, *ZW*, IX, 87-88; cf. Baum, *Capito und Butzer*, p. 372.
37. Copy of the mandate in Röhrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 33-34.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
39. Baum, *Capito und Butzer*, p. 592.
40. Capito to Zwingli, Strasbourg, November 7, 1527, *ZW*, IX, 299-300.
41. Butzer to A. Blaurer, Strasbourg, September 13, 1528, in Cornelius, *op. cit.*, II, 260.
42. Röhrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.
43. For a copy of the letter see *ibid.*, pp. 42-43.

44. Butzer to A. Blaurer, Strasbourg, February 8, 1528, cited by Gerbert, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
45. Röhrich, *op. cit.*, p. 36, f. 47.
46. Butzer to Zwingli, Strasbourg, June 24, 1528, *ZW*, IX, 492.
47. Gerbert, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
48. *Ibid.*
49. Cornelius, *op. cit.*, II, 271.
50. Röhrich, *op. cit.*, p. 48.
51. D. Johann Adam, *Evangelische Kirchengeschichte der Stadt Strassburg bis zur Franzoesischen Revolution* (Strasbourg: J. H. Ed. Heitz, 1922), p. 122.
52. John Horsch, "Strasburg, A Swiss Brethren Center," *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, XIII (January, 1939), 23.
53. Adam, *op. cit.*, p. 177.
54. Gerbert, *op. cit.*, p. 97.
55. Cornelius, *op. cit.*, II, 276.
56. Bellardi, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
57. Neff, "Capito," *ML*, I, 332.
58. Nicolaus Paulus, *Die Strassburger Reformatoren und die Gewissensfreiheit*, Vol. II of *Strassburger Theologische Studien* (Strasbourg: B. Herder, 1895), pp. 28-46.
59. Gerbert, *op. cit.*, p. 97.
60. Cornelius, *op. cit.*, II, 85.
61. Gerbert, *op. cit.*, p. 97.
62. *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.
63. *Ibid.*, pp. 100-101.
64. Copy of the ruling in Röhrich, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
66. For a record of the disputation see *ibid.*, pp. 53-55.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 55.
68. For a copy of the order banishing Marpeck see *ibid.*, p. 56.
69. Neff, "Butzer," *ML*, I, 311.
70. J. C. Wenger, "The Life and Work of Pilgram Marpeck," *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, XII (July, 1938), 153.
71. "Pilgram Marpeck's Confession of Faith Composed at Strasburg," transcribed and edited from the original by J. C. Wenger, *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, XII (July, 1938), 167-202.
72. *Ibid.*, 171.
73. Copy of the letter in Röhrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-58.
74. Adam, *op. cit.*, p. 205.
75. Neff, "Butzer," *ML*, I, 311.
76. Gerbert, *op. cit.*, pp. 180-81.
77. Neff, "Melchior Hofmann," *ML*, II, 332-33.
78. Gerbert, *op. cit.*, p. 181.
79. Adam, *op. cit.*, p. 208.
80. Horsch, "Strasburg . . .," *op. cit.*, p. 23.
81. Adam *op. cit.*, p. 210.
82. Gerbert, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
83. Butzer to Blaurer, Strasbourg, October 23, 1533, cited by Neff, "Butzer," *ML*, I, 312.
84. Hulshof, *op. cit.*, p. 247. For an English translation see Harold S. Bender, "The Anabaptists and Religious Liberty in the 16th Century," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, XLIV (1953), 40-41.
85. Copy of the mandate in Röhrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 106-109.
86. *Wiedertäuferakten, 1527-1626*, Vol. IV of *Urkundliche Quellen zur hessischen Reformationsgeschichte*, Division XI of *Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Hessen und Waldeck*, ed. by W. Köhler, W. Sohm, T. Sippell, and G. Franz (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1951), pp. 123-28.
87. Copy of the mandate in Röhrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-112.
88. For a copy of the special oath see *ibid.*, pp. 113-14.
89. For a copy of the mandate see *ibid.*, pp. 118-19.
90. Paulus, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-26.
91. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
92. Adam, *op. cit.*, p. 214.
93. *Ibid.*, p. 215.
94. Ernst Correll, "Elsass," *ML*, I, 553.
95. Hulshof, *op. cit.*, p. 159.
96. Heinrich Rocholl, *Anfänge der Reformation in Colmar* (Colmar: Land and Rasch, 1875), p. 64.
97. Timotheus W. Röhrich, *Geschichte der Reformation in Elsass und besonders Strassburg* (Strasbourg: Friedrich Carl Heitz, 1832), II, 254.
98. Correll, "Elsass," *ML*, I, 553.
99. *Ibid.*
100. *Ibid.*, p. 554.
101. Franck, *op. cit.*, p. ccccxiiiib.
102. Copy of the German text and English translation in H. S. Bender, "The Discipline Adopted by the Strasburg Conference of 1568," *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, I (January, 1927), 57-66.
103. Adam, *op. cit.*, p. 214.
104. Cited by Horsch, "Strasburg . . .," *op. cit.*, p. 27.
105. Walter Sohm, *Die Schule Johann Sturms und die Kirche Strassburgs ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältnis 1530-1581* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1912), pp. 133-36.
106. Bellardi, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-24.
107. *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25, 38 ff.

THE PACIFISM OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY ANABAPTISTS*

HAROLD S. BENDER, *Goshen College*

A preliminary word should be said about the propriety of the use of the late, twentieth-century term "pacifism" to apply to the peace doctrines of the sixteenth-century Anabaptists. As it has been used since World War I pacifism designates broadly an idealistic anti-militarist position whose goal is the elimination of war in history. It may be Christian or non-Christian, political or nonpolitical, but in any case, except for the radical Biblical nonresistant groups such as the older Quakers and the Mennonites, it is anchored largely in a basic belief in the goodness and perfectibility of man and the reformability of the general human society on rational grounds. The original "pacifism" of the Anabaptists (and Quakers or other "historic peace churches"), as we shall see, is of a different character, with quite other roots and premises, as well as other goals. In the sixteenth century there was, in the Renaissance humanism and Erasmian pacifism, a revulsion against war and an idealistic and Christian longing for peace. But there was no peace movement as such. Erasmus, Ludovicus Vives, and Sebastian Franck were solitary figures, although it is clear that for Erasmus humanism and a certain pacifism were inseparable. Ludovicus Vives (1492-1540) was the most uncompromising of the humanist pacifists, but also the most pessimistic. His two pacifist works, *De Concordia et Discordia in Humano Genere* (1526, dedicated to Charles V) and *De Pacificatione* (1529, dedicated to the Archbishop of Seville), are noble statements. His basic motivation was the restoration and maintenance of Christian unity. He did not believe, however, in the possibility of world peace upon the earth, so he worked for inner peace in the individual and looked forward to real peace in eternity. Erasmus is more the humanist who is hindered in his basic work and mobility by war. Franck's *Das Kriegbüchlein des Frides* (1539) is a vigorous attack on war, as the title announces, "a war of peace battling against all alarums, revolution, and senselessness with thorough demonstration . . . that war not only does not belong in the kingdom of Christ but is nothing else than a devilish, bestial, unchristian, inhuman thing. . . ."

In the midst of the truly bloody character of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, both in war and religious persecution, the con-

*Read before the American Society of Church History, New York, December 28, 1954.

sistent and continued radical nonresistance of peaceful Anabaptism is remarkable with its complete rejection of war and personal violence, and its insistence upon religious liberty. About the clarity and absolutism of the Anabaptist position there can be no question, as the evidence will show in a moment. With minor exceptions such as Balthasar Hubmaier (d. 1528) and the short-lived revolutionary Münsterites (1534ff) and Batenburgers, the entire movement from Courtrai to Königsberg and from Bern to Budapest, whether Swiss, German, Flemish, Frisian, Austrian, or Moravian, openly and vigorously broke with the universally accepted war system, or with the "sword" as they called it. For them the sword was "outside the perfection of Christ," as the Schleithem Confession of 1527 states it.¹ Before 1525, the birth date of Anabaptism, there were, to be sure, anti-war expressions in some of the medieval non-conformist groups such as the Waldenses, and no one has exceeded Peter Chelchitzky (*ca.* 1460) of Bohemia in his absolutist pacifism, but by the sixteenth century the Waldenses had forgotten the anti-militarism of their fathers, and Peter's was a lone voice in the wilderness. In any case Anabaptism had no genetic connection with these prior movements; it was born in the bosom of the Reformation, and its leaders came directly out of the Roman Church or had been loyal followers of Zwingli and Luther.

Our amazement at the pacifism of the sixteenth century Anabaptists only grows as we contemplate the belligerence of the period and the attitudes toward war of all the leading Reformers and popes as well as the Christian princes and emperors. The Truce of God, first applied in 1076, a genuine attempt to mitigate the slaughter of feudal wars and fratricidal conflicts, had long since lost its efficacy and been discarded. *Raubrittergeist* was still abroad. The principle of an allowable just war was fixed in the dogmatic theory of the medieval Roman Church, and taken over by the Reformers (Luther at first taught only a defensive war), but where can one find any justice in the endless warrings of the 16th century, except possibly in the defence against the Turks? Yet all the princes were "defenders of the faith," and should have obeyed the church on this point. The wars of the century were endless. In the brief 20-year public career of Sebastian Franck (1526-1544), the first Christian philosopher of history, who also wept over the wars of Christendom, there were four wars between France and Germany alone. Then there were the strange wars between the most Catholic Emperor Charles V, who was eager to restore the broken unity of the church, and the pope, who was the head of that church. In 1527 the troops of Charles V sacked Rome with a hitherto unheard-of slaughter, practically wiping out the cultured classes.

War was not only an accepted instrument of national or political

policy. It was also an instrument of the church. Men ought to serve God by using war as an instrument of religion, of the very kingdom of God itself, as the Catholic and Protestant military leagues of the Reformation period attest. Franz von Sickingen joyfully sprang to the assistance of Luther in his ill-fated attack on the Archbishop of Treves. Admiral Coligny and his Huguenot friends took to arms to save their faith from extermination in the bloody religious wars of sixteenth century France, as the Münsterites of 1534 had done against the Bishop of Münster's beleaguering army. And Luther called on the princes to "smite, slay, and destroy the mad dogs of the peasants," whose cause he had earlier called just, for the princes would thereby be serving a good purpose. Nor should we overlook Zwingli's scheme for a great Protestant military alliance to establish the Reformation once for all against its enemies (rejected by a clearer-visioned Luther) while he himself died on the battlefield of Cappel in a religious war against the Swiss Catholic cantons. It was not Thomas Müntzer alone who thought to establish God's righteousness by the sword.

Luther discussed the question of war and soldiering in the pamphlet *Ob Kriegsleute auch in seligem Stande sein können* (1526). In this pamphlet he concludes that "soldiers can be in a state of grace, for war is as necessary as eating, drinking, or any other business." But he goes even further to say, "The hand which bears the sword (i.e., the government) is as such no longer man's but God's, and not man it is, but God who hangs, breaks on the wheel, beheads, strangles."² Calvin abolished the distinction between the believer's private and public morality, placing the public morality of the state under the Old Testament. He held that the Sermon on the Mount cannot conflict with the politics of the pious kings of Israel and the Old Testament code.³ Calvin defended war as a means of public vengeance against evil. Beza affirmed the rightness of religious warfare on historical, Biblical, and dogmatic grounds. Troeltsch, in viewing the record of the reformers on this question, says, "The Protestant way out of the strain of a dual morality, personal and public, is not a solution but a reformulation of the problem."⁴

In the face of such a century consider the Anabaptists. The founder of Swiss Anabaptism, Conrad Grebel, spoke clearly in his famous letter of September 1524 to Thomas Müntzer, which includes a stiff rebuke to Müntzer for his reported readiness to "use the fist" against the princes, a letter which, by the way, should go far to nullify the theory of the Münsterian origin of Anabaptism.

"True, believing Christians are as sheep in the midst of wolves. . . . They . . . must reach the fatherland of eternal rest, not by overcoming bodily enemies with the sword, but by overcoming spiritual foes. They

use neither the worldly sword nor engage in war, since among them killing has ceased entirely, for we are no longer under the old covenant."⁶

Even before Grebel, in January 1523, Andreas Castelberger of the later Zürich Anabaptist circle (here I quote from the Zürich court records) was

"... saying much about war; how the divine teaching is so strong against it and how it is sin. And he expressed the idea that the soldier who had plenty at home in his fatherly inheritance and goods and yet went to war, and received money and pay to kill innocent persons and to take their possessions from people who had never done him any harm, such a soldier was before Almighty God, and according to the content of Gospel teaching, a murderer and not better than one who would murder and steal on account of his poverty, regardless of the fact that this might not be so according to human laws, and might not be counted so bad."⁶

It is important to note that both Castelberger and Grebel rejected war and killing while they were yet followers of Zwingli and before the beginning of persecution, contrary to the assertion of the chronicler Johannes Kessler, who claimed that they accepted the principle of nonresistance only after the government had enacted hostile measures against them.⁷

After the open break with Zwingli in January 1525, a steady flow of evidence is available throughout the 16th century in Switzerland, Germany, Holland, and Moravia on the Anabaptist testimony for Christian nonresistance and against war, killing, and the use of force in any form. Felix Manz, with Grebel a co-founder of the movement, said in December 1526, in the testimony in his trial before the Zürich court, which resulted in his martyrdom as the first Anabaptist martyr a few days later (again I quote from the court record): "It had always been his conviction and still was that no Christian could be a government officer, nor could he use the sword nor kill anyone nor punish, because he had no Scripture for it."⁸ In January 1527, in a farewell letter to his brethren before his martyrdom, Manz says, "Christ never hated anyone, therefore His true servants will also not hate and will accordingly follow Christ on the road on which He has gone before us."⁹

The spokesmen of the Swiss Brethren in the Zofingen disputation of 1532 said, "In Matthew 5 Christ forbids the believers all use of force."¹⁰ In the great Bern disputation of 1538 the Brethren spoke fully of their nonresistance, summarized as follows:

We grant that in the non-Christian world state authorities have a legitimate place, to keep order, to punish the evil, and to protect the good. But we as Christians live according to the Gospel and our only authority and Lord is Jesus Christ. Christians consequently do not use the sword,

which is worldly, but they use the Christian ban. There is a great difference between Christians and the world, the former living by the standards of the Sermon on the Mount and latter being perverted and governed by Satan. The world uses the sword; Christians use only spiritual weapons.¹¹

Without quoting other Swiss Anabaptist sources except Sattler, who will be cited later, let us accept the testimony of Bullinger, the successor to Zwingli as head of the Zürich church. In his book of 1531 against them (*Von dem unverschämpten frävel*) he quotes an Anabaptist in a fictitious dialogue as saying, "War is the worst evil that one can conceive" (*das ergist uebel das man erdenken kan*), to which the Reformed speaker in the dialogue replies, "It is truly a great evil when it is not begun and conducted with God." The Anabaptist then says further, "But do you think that the believers have even the right to go to war?" To which the Reformed speaker replies "Yes, much and great" (*Ja vil und dick*). The Anabaptist then demands that this be proved out of God's Word, which the Reformed speaker (actually Bullinger) does for almost three pages, beginning with Abraham's war against the three kings in Genesis 14, and ending with John the Baptist's advice to the soldiers in Luke 3, giving examples of Christian emperors along the way, such as Constantine and Theodosius.¹² In his second book against them in 1561 (*Der Widertoufferen Ursprung*) Bullinger gives similar testimony.

"They believe that Christians should stand ready to suffer (rather than strike back). No Christian may be a ruler. The government should not undertake to regulate matters of faith and religious practice. Christians do not resist violence and do not take recourse to law. They do not use the law courts. Christians do not kill. The punishment used by them is not imprisonment and the sword, but only church discipline. They do not defend themselves, therefore they do not go to war and are not obedient to the government on this point."¹³

Appended to Bullinger's second work just mentioned is a booklet written by spokesmen of the Swiss Brethren giving their reasons why they did not make common cause with the state church. The following quotation is taken from this booklet:

"The theologians of the established church have in the first period of their reformatory labors advocated the Christian, evangelical opinion that Christians should not protect themselves or their evangelical doctrine, by worldly, carnal force, sword, weapons or resistance, nor defend themselves in this way against their adversaries and opponents, but should use only the Word of God as the Sword of the Spirit and other weapons which are mentioned in Ephesians, chapter 6; and that they should not avenge themselves, nor resist evil. The worldly, Mosaic sword should not be found among them: they should not seek justice before a court of law on account of earthly possessions or honor, but should be willing to suffer and bear the cross, if they would be Christians. And this, their former doctrine, is clearly founded on the New Testament Scriptures."¹⁴

Before we leave the Swiss Brethren we must report that one of the outstanding early Anabaptist leaders, Dr. Balthasar Hubmaier (martyred May 1528), did not share the nonresistant position of the Swiss Brethren. In his booklet *On the Sword*, written June 24, 1527, at Nikolsburg, Moravia, where he was the leader of a large Anabaptist congregation, he attempted to persuade the Brethren by many arguments that their anti-war position was unscriptural, and advocated the view that the Christian may use the sword both in war and as an officer of the government. The two Nikolsburg disputations of 1527, which dealt among other things with the urgent question of payment of war taxes levied by the Moravian Landtag in view of the serious threat of the Turkish advance on Vienna, resulted in a split of the congregation. Hubmaier's followers were called *Schwertler*, in contrast to the others who were called *Stäbler*. It is worthy of note that the *Schwertler* party of Hubmaier's followers soon died out (no trace is found of them after 1529), whereas the party of the absolute non-resistants, who would not even pay the war tax, survived as the great Hutterite movement. The only other known Anabaptist leaders in Switzerland, Germany, or Austria-Moravia who did not share the full nonresistant position were Ambrosius Spitalmaier (martyred 1528) and Jacob Gross (recanted Anabaptism in 1531), who for a time in 1525 was a member of Hubmaier's congregation at Waldshut. While in prison at Strasbourg on August 9, 1526, Gross declared himself ready in effect for noncombatant military service. He would stand watch and carry a gun, but would not consent to take human life, "for to kill a human being is not required in any commandment of God."¹⁵

An outstanding case of Anabaptist nonresistant testimony is that of the noted Michael Sattler, who was ready to be nonresistant even toward the Turks. Sattler, a friend of Butzer, who called him "a dear friend of God" and "a martyr of Christ,"¹⁶ and who protested his martyrdom in May 1527, at Rottenburg on the Neckar, was probably the author of the first Anabaptist confession, the *Seven Articles of Schleithem* of February 24, 1527, whose 6th article, "On the Sword," declares, "The sword is outside the perfection of Christ," and forbids the Christian both to bear the sword as a magistrate and to "employ it against the wicked for the defense and protection of the good, or for the sake of love."¹⁷

One of the most telling charges against Sattler as reported in the record of his trial,¹⁸ published in several versions almost immediately after his execution, was the accusation that he had taught that if the Turks came into the country no resistance should be offered. Indeed, if war could be morally justified, he would rather fight

against the Christians than against the Turks. This charge could not fail to make the deepest impression on the court. The Turks for years had been considered the worst foe of the empire and the Christian faith. Vast sums of money had been sacrificed by the faithful and paid as a Turkish war tax to make war on the archfoe of Christendom. King Ferdinand had been caused inexpressible distress by the Turks; at great pains he had aroused the German estates and raised an army to fight them. And now the Turk was to be considered less dangerous than he and the representatives of the old faith. To be sure, Sattler was not charged, as other Anabaptists had been, with having made an alliance with the Turks, but the charge that was made was sufficient to make him an archtraitor to the empire.

Concerning this charge Sattler admitted that he had taught that if the Turk should come no armed resistance should be made, for it is written, Thou shalt not kill. We should not resist any of our persecutors with the sword, but with prayer cling to God, that He may resist and defend. Sattler even admitted having said that if war were right, he would rather march against supposed Christians who persecute, capture, and kill the God-fearing. The Turk knows nothing about the Christian faith; he is a "Turk according to the flesh." "But you want to be considered Christians, boast of being Christ's, and still persecute His pious witnesses; You are Turks according to the spirit."¹⁹

The infidel Turks who were before Vienna in 1529 continued to pound at the gates to the West for another century and a half. Throughout this time the Hutterite Anabaptists refused to join in the fight against them, either by taking arms, or making arms, or paying war taxes. The situation would be quite comparable to that of Western Europe today with the infidel communists threatening western Christian civilization. Nothing could better test the sincerity and fortitude of sixteenth century Anabaptist pacifism. Peter Riedemann's classic Hutterite confession of 1545 speaks boldly:

"Now since Christ, the Prince of Peace, hath prepared and won for Himself a kingdom, that is a Church through His own blood; in this same kingdom all worldly warfare has an end, as was promised aforetime. . . . Therefore a Christian neither wages war nor wields the worldly sword to practice vengeance. . . . Now if vengeance is God's and not ours, it ought to be left to Him and not practiced or exercised by ourselves. For, since we are Christ's disciples, we must show forth the nature of Him who though He could, indeed, have done so, repaid no evil with evil. . . . There is therefore no need for many words, for it is clear that Christians can neither go to war nor practice vengeance. Whosoever doeth this hath forsaken and denied Christ and Christ's nature."²⁰

And in the time of the greatest Turkish threat (1594-1605) the Hutterites of Moravia flatly refused, under the heaviest pressure

from the Emperor Rudolphus II, to pay war levies, or to grant war loans. Twice, in 1596 and 1604, the Hutterite Bishop Braidle of Neu-mühl, Moravia, addressed to the emperor formal letters of refusal to grant such support "for conscience' sake."²¹

The very large and powerful Anabaptist movement in the Netherlands (until 1555 it was the strongest part of Protestantism in that corner of Europe) is well represented by its leader Menno Simons (active 1536-1561), after whom the movement was named, who repeatedly and clearly taught complete nonresistance. Three samples will suffice:

(1) The regenerated do not go to war, nor engage in strife. They are the children of peace who have beaten their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks, and know of no war. They render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's. Their sword is the sword of the Spirit which they wield with a good conscience through the Holy Ghost.²²

(2) Since we are to be conformed to the image of Christ (Rom. 8:29), how can we then fight our enemies with the sword? Does not the Apostle Peter say: "For even hereunto were ye called, because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps; who did no sin neither was guile found in his mouth; who, when he was reviled, reviled not again" etc. (1 Pet. 2:21-23; Matt. 16:24).²³

(3) I am well aware that the tyrants who boast themselves Christians attempt to justify their horrible wars and shedding of blood, and would make a good work of it by referring us to Moses, Joshua, etc. But they do not reflect that Moses and his successors, with their iron sword, have served out their time and that Jesus Christ has now given us a new commandment and has girded our loins with another sword. . . . They do not consider that they use the sword of war contrary to all evangelical Scripture against their own brethren, namely those of like faith with them who have received the same baptism and have broken the same bread with them and are thus members of the same body.²⁴

The some two thousand Anabaptist martyrs whose stories are told first in *Het Offer des Heeren* (1562 and succeeding editions) and then in the great *Martyrs' Mirror* of 1660, were without exception nonresistant. The very title of the great martyr book tells the story, *The Bloody Theatre, or Martyrs' Mirror of the Defenceless Christians Who Suffered and Were Put to Death for the Testimony of Jesus Their Saviour*.

It should be added, of course, that the Anabaptists scarcely faced the direct challenge of universal compulsory military service in the sixteenth century. The nearest to such a challenge came in Holland in 1557 when Prince William of Orange granted them exemption from military service, and the Anabaptists in turn aided the cause of Dutch independence with gifts and loans.²⁵

The nature of the nonresistance of the sixteenth century Anabaptists is clear from their testimonies. It is first of all Biblical, and

is argued from all the familiar teachings of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere, as well as Romans 12, I Peter 2, etc., including the example of Christ and the apostles. If the examples of war in the Old Testament were brought up, the Anabaptists answered that the Old Covenant has been displaced by the New, and the teachings of Jesus supersede those of Moses and Joshua; Christ is now our Lord, not the Old Testament. Their critics were hard put to find any good answer to the Scriptural argument, except to fall back upon the Old Testament and insist upon its prior and higher authority, and to add that, after all, Christ did not condemn the warriors of the Old Testament and did not specifically forbid warfare. The Anabaptists and the Reformers clearly had divergent doctrines of Scripture on the point of the relation of the two Testaments.

Calvin had no trouble at all in making the Old Testament the source of his war ethic, but for Luther, for whom personal faith in Christ was all in all, and who judged the books of the New Testament by how much they contained of Christ, it was not so simple. His solution, at least in the earlier period, was to acknowledge the law of love and nonresistance as found in the Sermon on the Mount and apply it to the personal life of the Christian, but to deny its application to the conduct of government, a solution similar in its way to the Roman Catholic ethical dualism which held the monks and the clergy to a higher stand on war than the common people. The Christian lived in two worlds, said Luther; as a citizen of the kingdom of Christ he could not fight, but as a citizen of this world he was bound to fight at the command of his prince.

Here is where the Anabaptists and Luther parted. For them there could be no such a dualism. They agreed that the government had the right and necessity to use the sword, according to God's institution, but since the Christian could not use the sword, he could not take part in government. It is from this viewpoint alone that the Anabaptists declined to serve in the magistracy. They did not reject government as such; they were not anarchists.

Now one may charge the Anabaptists with being naive, but certainly they were consistent. They may not have thought through to the bitter end the logic of their withdrawal, but they at least intended to be uncompromisingly obedient to Christ and the New Testament as they understood it. Christ was for them not only a divine being to be worshipped, and a Saviour from judgment, but a Master to whom they were disciples, a Lord to be followed and obeyed. They read the New Testament simply and obeyed it literally.

But how could they be so naive as to insist upon withdrawal from the government as the requirement for Christians? Was it because

they were eschatologically minded and expected the near end of the world, so that it mattered little what happened to the government? There is little evidence for this, although the Hutterite chronicle speaks frequently of the times as "diese letzte gefährliche Zeit."

The answer is to be found rather in their doctrine of the two worlds. The new kingdom of God which is being established in their terms and through them (see Littell's discussion in his *Anabaptist View of the Church*) is of necessity distinct from the world order which is dominated by Satan. That the church and state join in persecuting the true church is only one more bit of evidence of the wickedness of the world order, they concluded. The old church (both Roman Catholic and Protestant) has failed particularly in its mixing of the two kingdoms, hence the true church must be, and is being, re-established separate from the world. This true church is the present kingdom of Christ which is being established in the midst of and alongside of the kingdom of this world; it is not to be deferred to some millennial future.

The Anabaptists further developed a martyr-theology and a doctrine of the suffering church. The martyr church was to be able to establish its place in history through suffering. As Ethelbert Stauffer has pointed out in his valuable article in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (1933) on "The Martyr-Theology of the Anabaptists," the Anabaptists saw the whole of history from the fall of the first Adam down to the Second Coming of Christ as a great battle between God and His enemies; just as Christ was victor through His cross and suffering, so the suffering church would be victorious with Him in its cross and suffering, if not in the sixteenth century, at least in God's good time. For such a church nonresistance was not a weak cover for a necessary yielding to superior force; it was the supreme weapon of the Christ for conquest through His church. Here we have no idealistic or humanistic vision of getting rid of war in history; we deal rather with the very heart of Christian faith. In the evil world as it is, there is no other lot for the Christian but to suffer, but through this suffering he will conquer. So we see the Anabaptist martyrs by the hundreds going to the stake with joyful confidence, and openly turning their places of execution into evangelistic platforms. So we can understand why in some places the authorities forbade further public executions because of their attractive power in winning converts. "The blood of the martyrs," Tertullian had said long before, "is the seed of the church."

A final question concerns the relation of Anabaptist nonresistance to Erasmian pacifism. Did perhaps the early Swiss Anabaptists, or even the Dutch or the Hutterites, draw their anti-war ideas from

Erasmus, who with possibly Ludovicus Vives, was the only man of outspoken pacifistic spirit in the first quarter of the sixteenth century? This question is in turn involved in the larger question of the relation of Anabaptism to humanism, particularly of the Erasmian type. The thesis of the humanistic origin of Anabaptism has been advocated by no less an authority than Walther Koehler, and is attractive indeed, but it is difficult to follow in the face of the evidence. Literary dependence or personal relationships have not been proved, whatever ideological similarities there may be in the field of ethics. Anabaptism can be understood as essentially the logical unfolding of the central Reformation principles, only freed from the holdover medieval church concept of the *Corpus Christianum* with its cultural bonds. *Sola Scriptura* is sufficient to account for the pacifism of the Anabaptists. Matthew 5 persuaded Luther in his earlier years to accept personal nonresistance. It was his sense of responsibility to or solidarity with the established social order which prevented him from taking the nonresistance position to its full consequence as the Anabaptists did, just as this same concept of responsibility has kept Reinhold Niebuhr from continuing in his earlier pacifism, and no doubt keeps many other modern Christians from accepting the Christian pacifism which they believe is the authentic teaching of Jesus. Did not the Amsterdam World Council define war as mankind's greatest collective sin?

But were not some of the early Anabaptists humanists, possibly under the influence of the Erasmus who wrote *Querella Pacis* in 1516? Since Conrad Grebel himself, as well as Zwingli, under whose influence he became a Protestant, was once a humanist, I made a thorough examination²⁶ of the question of the possible influence of Erasmus on Grebel in respect to the pacifist position, but without finding much light on the question. In Zürich itself, in the circle of Grebel's intimate friends, there was considerable interest in the question of war and peace. As early as 1520 his good friend Oswald Myconius had written a tract against war entitled *Philirenus*, which he circulated among his friends for criticism. On August 30, 1520, Grebel had a copy in possession, which he read with great interest and "found so true" that he expressed the conviction that it deserved to be printed and thus to be made permanent. Other friends, however, were influential in persuading Myconius to withhold the pamphlet from publication. It is well known that in the years 1520-1522 and even later, the pacifist viewpoint was present in the Zwingli circle in Zürich. Zwingli had probably taken it over from Erasmus. However, the pacifist convictions of Zwingli and his friends must not have been very deep, at least not deep enough to leave any permanent influence upon their thinking, for before long Zwingli was actively engaged in planning a great mili-

tary alliance to fight the pope, and as is well known he died at the head of the army of Zürich on the battlefield of Cappel in 1531. Grebel reports in a letter to Vadian in 1524, that Zwingli had preached a *kriegspredigt, et populus applausit manibus*.²⁷ If, then, Grebel maintained his pacifism while Zwingli lost his, there must have been some fundamental difference in the thinking of the two men on the question. This difference can probably be discovered by a comparison of the pacifism of Erasmus with the nonresistance of Conrad Grebel.

The opposition of Erasmus to war was derived primarily from a number of diverse philosophical, sociological, moral, and religious arguments, many of which are valid and useful in building up a conviction against war. But even though there is a religious tone and coloring in Erasmus' thought on the question of war and peace, as well as sincere Christian conviction, nevertheless the Erasmian pacifism was primarily humanitarian in character and not theological and Biblical, except in its emphasis on the mystical unity of the body of Christ in the Sacrament. The one general argument against participation in war which Grebel used in his letter to Müntzer, the argument of the "the suffering church," is not only not found in Erasmus, but is at the opposite pole from his position. A still further and significant difference between Erasmus and Grebel lies in the fact that Grebel was an absolutist on the question of war and violence, and consistently rejected all killing, including therefore wars in self-defense, whereas Erasmus, although he at times used very sharp words against war, was ready not only to permit a defensive war, but even any just war. Doctor Ines Thürlemann, who has made a thorough study of Erasmus as a pacifist, has shown in her doctoral dissertation that this was a characteristic feature of the position of Erasmus on war. She quotes him at one place as saying: "Citizens may be permitted to fight, but it must be a just war. Whether the war is just or not and in what manner and against whom it is to be fought, that must be left to the decision of the ruler."²⁸ Between the relativism of an Erasmus who would be willing to let a ruler decide whether a war was just or not, and the absolutism of a Grebel who would dare to say that "among true believing Christians killing is done away with altogether," there is considerable distance. It is probable that the humanist Conrad Grebel of 1520 to 1522 was in spirit an Erasmian pacifist, and that this opened the door of his mind to the teaching of the New Testament, particularly the Sermon on the Mount, and to the logical deduction from the fundamental concept of the "suffering church" that no longer a humanitarian pacifist but a believer in the principle of Biblical nonresistance, which is something quite different. Christians should suffer and not fight; but the Grebel of 1525 was

1. J. C. Wenger, "The Schleithem Confession of Faith," *Menn. Quart. Review*, XIX (1945) 250.
2. *Luthers Werke*, Weimar ed., XIX, 626.
3. E. Troeltsch, *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen* (Tübingen, 1912) 637.
4. G. J. Heering, *The Fall of Christianity* (London, 1930) 79.
5. H. S. Bender, *Conrad Grebel* (Goshen, 1950) 179.
6. *Ibid.*, 200.
7. *Johannes Kesslers Sabbata* (St. Gall, 1902) 143.
8. L. von Muralt and W. Schmid, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz*. Erster Band: Zürich (Zürich, 1952) 216.
9. *Ibid.*, 219.
10. *Handlung oder Acta gehaltenen Disputation und Gespräch zu Zoffingen inn Berner Biet mit den Widertöufferen* (1532) 94 v.
11. From the unprinted manuscript record of the Bern disputation in the Staatsarchiv of Bern, "Unnütze Papiere."
12. H. Bullinger, *Der Widertöufferen Ursprung, Fürgang, Secten, Wösen*, (Zürich, 1561) 139 v.
13. *Ibid.*, fol. 16.
14. *Verantwortung etlicher die man Töuffer nennt, uff die Fragen warumb sy nit zur kirchen gangind*, fol. 218 v.
15. Quoted from the Strasbourg court records for 1526 by C. A. Cornelius, *Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufruhrs*, Vol. II (Leipzig, 1860) 268.
16. Quoted from Butzer's *Getreue Warnung* (Strasbourg, July 1527) by A. Hulshof, *Geschiedenis van de Doopsgezinden te Straatsburg van 1525 tot 1557* (Amsterdam, 1905) 28.
17. Wenger, *loc. cit.*, 250.
18. G. Bossert, "Michael Sattler's Trial and Martyrdom," *Menn. Quart. Review*, XXV (1951) 201-218, gives the bibliography of the early publication of the Sattler trial report, p. 208.
19. Bossert, *loc. cit.*, 213.
20. *Account of our Religion, Doctrine and Faith given by Peter Rideman* (London?, 1950) 108. Translated from the German edition of 1565.
21. A. J. F. Zieglschmid, ed., *Die älteste Chronik der Hutterischen Brüder* (Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, 1943) 575-79 and 620-26.
22. *The Complete Works of Menno Simon* (Elkhart, Ind., 1871) Part II, 170b.
23. *Ibid.*, II, 435 b.
24. *Ibid.*, I, 198.
25. N. van der Zijpp, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Nederland* (Arnhem, 1952) 134. See also J. Dyserineck, "De Weerlosheid volgens de Doopsgezinden," *De Gida* 1890, 104-161 and 303-342; and N. van der Zijpp, *De Vroegere Doopsgezinden en de Krijgsdienst* (Wolvega, 1930) 26 *et passim*.
26. H. S. Bender, *Conrad Grebel* (Goshen, Ind., 1950) 199-203.
27. *Ibid.*, 274, note 54.
28. Inez Thürlleman, *Erasmus von Rotterdam und Joannes Ludovicus Vives als Pazifisten* (Freiburg, Switzerland, 1932, dissertation), 44, quoted from Le Clere's (1703ff) edition of Erasmus' complete works, Vol. II, 963E.

RECENT INTERPRETATIONS OF ANABAPTISM*

ROBERT FRIEDMANN, *Western Michigan College of Education*

When in the process of historical research the step is taken from a mere collecting of facts to a meaningful interpretation of these facts, we may speak of the maturity of this historical research. If that is true in general history, it is even more significant in the field of church history where ideas and spiritual principles dominate the scene. But the difficulties in this area are even more conspicuous than elsewhere. A perfectly objective church historiography is almost impossible due to the inevitable bias of the writer, his sympathies and his restricted ability to appreciate phenomena in widely different fields. In fact, no historiography can do without a set of categories and concepts of a specific nature, and the choice of these is definitely the work of the particular research person and his preferences. Whether such a person is a Catholic or a Lutheran, a liberal or a neo-orthodox, will certainly influence his picture and his conclusions, if ever so slightly, no matter how hard he may strive for scholarly objectivity.

The story of the Anabaptists is a good illustration of this situation. Most official church historiographies missed, either completely or in significant parts, this unfamiliar subject. It was understood either as the fanatical fringe of Protestantism, or as a self-meritorious and moralizing experiment which was bound to fail sooner or later. Its place in the total history of the Christian Church has never been clearly defined, and our textbooks insert, at best, one chapter on it out of organic connection with the rest. That "in-group" research often does not improve on this picture is true enough due to the natural bias of the research persons.

So it happens that Anabaptism still presents to us an oscillating phenomenon: on the one hand it is understood as a "Left-Wing" experiment of the Reformation, interesting though soon fading out, and on the other hand it is looked at as an experiment in the realization of genuine though radical Christianity whose problems apply to some extent to everyone and reach far beyond mere historical interest. The claim would go that principles are involved which challenge the mind of any earnest Christian. If that is correct, then Anabaptism takes a unique place in the picture of the sixteenth century struggle for new patterns of Christian realization. It becomes apparent here that interpretation may become a truly controversial issue.

*Read, in part, before the American Church History Society, Evanston, April 24, 1953.

For a long time an excuse was at hand on both sides of the controversy: namely that we do not know well enough the facts proper, the events and the ideas behind them. This, fortunately, is no longer true. A wealth of source material has become available in recent years which greatly changed the picture. The Täuferakten Kommission (T.A.K.), an organization for the publication of all available sources (in the German language), has done an admirable job: five volumes are on hand, covering main areas of the Anabaptist movement and also some major testimonies (*Glaubenszeugnisse*). Independently from these TAK-publications, one such volume came out recently on Hesse and another one on Switzerland, the latter dealing with less than the first decade of the movement. The collection is to be continued. One volume on Alsace is nearly ready, another volume of testimonies likewise. Austria and Moravia are just now being worked upon, more is in the stage of planning. Still more important are other source publications such as the two Hutterite *Chronicles* edited by the late Professor A. J. F. Zieglschmid; the English version of Riedemann's great *Confession of Faith* of 1540-5; smaller Anabaptist tracts translated by Professor John C. Wenger (in the *Mennonite Quarterly Review*); and a new Menno Simons edition in English, now in preparation. Admirable though this is, much more is still needed to familiarize the scholars with the almost inexhaustible source material extant. The new series of *Christian Classics* (Westminster Press) will include a volume of Anabaptist sources in English translation. The writer of this paper has been commissioned to bring out a volume of Anabaptist epistles. Other promising materials are in preparation at various centers of research.

But the time has now come to go beyond a mere collecting and confirming of factual data. Interpretations of the meaning and essence of this so intriguing "left-wing" movement of the sixteenth century have been attempted time and again. Earlier claims that the Anabaptists were just a mild but perfectly orthodox branch of Protestantism (John Horsch belonged to this group) cannot be considered successful any longer. It was an interpretation from the position of American Mennonitism around the turn of the century when it was strongly felt that the church had long become a Protestant denomination like any other in this country. Other attempts from liberal out-group historians were not much more successful. They recognized the moral seriousness of these sectarians, and this moved them either in the neighborhood of Erasmian Christianity or perhaps even nearer to Calvinist patterns. No better, that is, no new categories were available for a reinterpretation of the historical phenomenon of Anabaptism.

In the last decade and a half, things have changed a great deal.

Of these changes, and of a few new categories introduced into modern church historiography, the present paper will try to give a brief account. It will fall into two parts: first, the account proper, and second, the attempt toward a systematic analysis of basic problems and answers. Since the writer had already once, in 1940, tried such an analysis,¹ which listed all the then available aspects, it seems advisable not to go further back but to study what has been achieved between 1940 and 1954.

INTERPRETATIONS

1940-1954

In 1943, Dean Harold S. Bender of Goshen College gave as his presidential address to the American Society of Church History his revealing paper, *The Anabaptist Vision*,² one of the most felicitous formulations ever attempted. He sees the essence of Anabaptism in three basic elements: (1) a new concept of the church as a "brotherhood of committed disciples," (2) a new concept of the essence of Christianity as discipleship, and (3) a new ethics of love. This paper was so successful that it has been reprinted many times and also been published in the Dutch, French, German and Italian languages. In 1949, the present writer published his volume, *Menonite Piety Through the Centuries*,³ in which the tension between Anabaptism and Pietism was studied in great detail. As we shall come back to this issue later on, it might be left undiscussed at this place. In 1950, H. S. Bender brought out his long expected work on Conrad Grebel⁴ (who died as early as 1526). Valuable to us is particularly the last chapter of the book, "Things most surely believed." The core of these is the idea of the "suffering church" whose members are to face persecution for conscience's sake simply by dint of their absolute nonconformity to the world. In the same year 1950, the "Anabaptist-Theology" issue of the *Menonite Quarterly Review*⁵ presented a number of significant papers which found wide attention. In 1951, John C. Wenger of Goshen College (to whom we owe much for his translations of Anabaptist tracts and for his Marpeck studies, one of which was published in *Church History*) published a helpful small book, *Doctrines of the Menonites*.⁶ Though not fully systematic it yet helps a great deal toward clarification of (as he puts it) "some unique emphases in Anabaptist-Menonite doctrine." The formula: "the church as a fellowship of committed disciples," first used by H. S. Bender, seems to be particularly fortunate and is most likely here to stay. Surprisingly enough for the outsider is the paucity of Anabaptist-cation by faith and atonement, elsewhere in Protestantism the very Menonite material concerning the doctrines of salvation, justifi-

core of theology. We must reflect on this negative factor more in detail in our systematic part.

In 1952, Dr. Franklin H. Littell, former Dean of the Boston University Chapel, brought out his excellent book, *The Anabaptist View of the Church*.⁷ As a piece of "out-group" research in this field it deserves special attention. The idea of "restitution" of the true, i.e. apostolic church, looms large in it, also the idea of Christian primitivism, by which modern term Littell wants to interpret the spirit and essence of Anabaptism.—In the same year a Viennese doctoral dissertation was published for the first time (in an English translation), Franz Heimann's paper, "The Hutterite Doctrine of Church and Common Life, a Study of Riedemann's *Confession* of 1540."⁸ In the opinion of the writer it belongs to the best studies in this field. Here we learn of the hidden (Biblical) spiritualism of the brethren and the unique combination of it with a practical organization of the brotherhood. Without the latter, to be sure, Anabaptism would not be what it actually is. The idea of the "Fellowship of the Lord's Table" as the very center of the Hutterite church idea is a real gain for the ongoing discussion.

Two more out-group publications of high value came out in the same year 1952: Wilhelm Wiswedel's third volume of his so excellent *Bilder und Führergestalten aus dem Täuferium*,⁹ in which he utilizes as no one else has done the precious material of the so-called "Beck Collection" in the state archive of Brno, Moravia, one of the richest mines of Anabaptistica in the world.¹⁰ It is planned to have all three volumes published in an English version which may become a real eye-opener to many. Wiswedel is a Baptist minister in Germany, now in his seventies, who has dedicated a great deal of his life to this kind of research. His book is both scholarly and narrative in character. Another piece of narrative-analytical historiography of first rank is a study by Fritz Blanke, professor of Church History in Zurich, Switzerland, concerning "The First Anabaptist Congregation: Zollikon, 1525."¹¹ It is based on source material recently made accessible in the Switzerland volume of the *Täuferakten*.

In 1953, Dean Harold S. Bender published a fine study of a topic never broached before: "The Anabaptists and Religious Liberty in the Sixteenth Century,"¹² in which he gives ample proof that the Anabaptists belong to the earliest champions of religious liberty, although for reasons very different from those of humanist defenders like Castellio.

Not very much has been done thus far to clarify the theological ideas of these Anabaptist brethren. This might be due, in part, to the fact that most sources are of a non-theological nature (as is fitting

to a sectarian movement), and in part because the problem has not yet been fully visualized in this area. What was the very idea of salvation and redemption among Anabaptists, what do they teach concerning atonement and justification, and what, finally, do they teach about free will and predestination? Actually there is much material available already but it will require a great deal of empathy for its proper interpretation and placement.¹³ Quotations alone would hardly satisfy.

A highly challenging study of this interpretative nature is A. Orley Swartzentruber's paper, *The Piety and Theology of the Anabaptist Martyrs in Van Braght's Martyrs' Mirror*.¹⁴ The author observes a marked change in emphasis between the earlier period (to 1560) and the later period (to 1600) of Anabaptist history. The earlier phase is characterized by three key words: revelation (a pneumatic experience), discipleship (brotherly love in practice) and kingdom (martyr-mindedness with an eschatological orientation). The later period, mainly in the North where persecution had ceased, is characterized by the key words: obedience (acceptance of the New Testamental commandments as the new order), and heaven (the place of rest). Grace as a personal charismatic experience, so strong in the first period and leading to courageous witnessing, is now more and more lost as the brotherhoods become formalized and well established.

Quite helpful is also the predominantly theological paper by Hans G. Fischer, a Lutheran minister of Vienna, Austria, entitled, *Lutheranism and the Vindication of the Anabaptist Way*,¹⁵ in which the concepts of justification and sanctification are discussed in their mutual tension. For the Anabaptists the way to conquer sin as far as humanly possible had at all times the precedence over the concern for salvation. But such a way, to be sure, is possible only *sola gratia*, and must never be understood as a type of work-righteousness or perfectionism.

SOME MAJOR CATEGORIES OF THESE INTERPRETATIONS

As we now turn to a scanning of the results of these recent endeavors, we may group these formulations of the "essence of Anabaptism" into those by "out-group" scholars and those by "in-group" scholars. (The term I have borrowed from Franklin H. Littell). In 1935, Professor Arthur Lovejoy of John Hopkins University introduced the term "primitivism" into the history of ideas. Some years later Roland H. Bainton of Yale Divinity School applied it generally to the "Left-Wing of the Reformation."¹⁶ Franklin H. Littell devotes a whole chapter (ch. III) to this idea of "Christian primitivism," using as his subtitle "The Fall of the Church." Anabaptism is thus

considered as a form of "religious primitivism." Littell underscores the particular concept of the "church" as the very essence of Anabaptism. This contention was challenged in a paper by H. S. Bender of Goshen College. I am not so sure, either, whether "Christian primitivism" is too helpful a term. It is true that Anabaptists do speak of the corruption of the church after it made its peace with the Roman State under Constantine the Great. But in this criticism they do not stand alone. It seems to me that Anabaptism is more than simply Christian primitivism, although some of it enters the picture, too, without doubt. As to the supplementary idea of "Restitution" or "Restoration" of the primitive church here and now, it has to be said that the source material does not fully bear out this claim. Do its defenders (generally speaking the school around Roland H. Bainton¹⁷) mean to say that the evangelical Anabaptists actually planned such a restoration? Frank J. Wray in a recent paper admits that "the term restitution was used more frequently by those on the fringe of Anabaptism than by the representatives of the main stream of the movement."¹⁸ But he adds that this does not mean that among the Anabaptists at least the characteristic "attitude" of restoration was not much alive also,—which to a certain extent is correct. If attitudes are considered, however, it would still be more correct to say that what concerned these brethren was not so much a historical re-establishment of something previously lost, but rather obedience to the divine will without any reservation. In other words, they think in terms of a *continuation* of the "true church," the timeless and perennial community of genuine believers. That the brethren sometimes refer to the church of the apostles, so-to-speak as their model, does not really indicate their restitution-mindedness but should be understood rather as a way of illustration of their own intent, and perhaps also as an encouragement to continue in their difficult endeavor. Restitution has too strongly an historical connotation to fit perfectly to the idea of discipleship and the imitation of Christ.¹⁹

Occasionally, Littell uses also another descriptive term for the Anabaptists: he calls them the "covenant people" (borrowing this term most likely from Ch. Burrage, *The Church Covenant Idea*, 1904). I would welcome the wider acceptance of this term as it stresses the absolutely obligatory nature of membership in these brotherhoods. Through adult-baptism members enter a covenant, to be sure not among themselves but between God and themselves. Although Littell does not quote it in his book, one of the most often repeated verses in Anabaptist writings is I Peter 3:21, "Baptism [of adults] is the covenant of a good conscience with God."²⁰ To me this appears as one of the key ideas in Anabaptism, and it becomes particularly revealing if one

thinks of the position of Luther who had little use for the term "good conscience" in view of man's sinfulness. Peter Riedemann, however, speaks in his great confession, the *Rechenschaft* of 1540, of this covenant as a "covenant of child-like freedom." "We are the children of it," he says, "if we let ourselves be sealed by this covenant and submit and surrender ourselves to its working."²¹

Many a scholar has claimed that Anabaptism was "biblical literalism," thus creating anew the "legalism" which Luther had abolished in opposition to the Roman Church. Truly enough, the New Testament (more than the Old) revealed to the brethren the norm and direction of all their seeking and finding. They declined any spiritualism other than a Biblical one, claiming that only the man with a spirit akin to the Scriptures can understand the latter. Nevertheless, it was only in later centuries, when the original fervor had died out, that the Bible becomes "the letter" to the last item, an attitude which has often led to formalism and even fossilization (as is the case with today's Hutterites and Amish). In the sixteenth century such letter-worship was nearly unknown. True, the brethren were Scriptural in everything, but only by virtue of their inner, i.e. spiritual understanding. It is the "living word" as they called it, "that pierces the soul," never the dead letter.²²

Fritz Blanke of Zurich called Anabaptism a genuine revival movement (*Erweckungsbewegung*), and that it certainly was. Inner rebirth is emphasized as the very beginning of a Christian life of this kind and as its precondition. Since neither Luther nor Zwingli stressed such revival or conversion, Anabaptism might be justly called "the" awakening movement of the sixteenth century. The difference lies only in the proper understanding of this term. Revival movements and awakenings have occurred many times in church history and belong, for instance, also to the very nature of American Christendom. Obviously the idea of "revival movement" contains a certain ambiguity which becomes particularly evident when we think of the ease with which later Anabaptism changed into a pietistic form of Christianity. Apparently, a revival movement in the sixteenth century was very different in kind from a revival movement in the eighteenth century or later. Also the often applied term "sanctification of life," which is traditionally contrasted to "justification from sin," will need further clarification. Certainly, Anabaptism as a "way" rather than a theology emphasized sanctification of life to such an extent that life in its totality became almost one great sacrament. Nevertheless, also the Pietists and their Anglo-Saxon counterpart, the Methodists, speak often of such sanctification side by side with justification, and the confusion of terms becomes obvious.

From here we now turn to some formulations nearer to the center of the actual phenomena. Ethelbert Stauffer spoke in 1933 of an "Anabaptist Theology of Martyrdom"²³ as most characteristic for the life of the brethren. Harold S. Bender, who himself emphasized the idea of a "suffering church" with Conrad Grebel and his successors, rejects Stauffer's term "theology" in this connection. The idea of martyrdom, he contends, is the background of the picture rather than the contents of the faith for which the Anabaptists bled and died. Although this criticism is correct, it is yet good to put the spotlight on this issue, for only such a martyr-mindedness makes it bearable for the victims to face so much suffering and to bear it "with a laughing mouth," as the Hutterite *Chronicle* once reported on such an occasion. The idea of the "bitter Christ," who requires complete self-surrender, in opposition to the "sweet Christ," who would not burden man with such requirement (it was Thomas Müntzer who once contrasted in this way his own idea of Christ with that of Luther) is certainly present also in the Anabaptist outlook, and makes the readiness to suffer "for the sake of the Kingdom" better understandable. One of their violent opponents, the Dominican preacher Johannes Faber of Heilbronn (d. 1557), even wrote a small tract in 1550 on this fact with the characteristic subtitle, "Whence it cometh that Anabaptists suffer the pain of death so cheerfully and confidently."²⁴

The next and last of our interpretations is most likely the best of all, the one which explains more than any earlier named attempt. And it is one which eliminates ambiguity and misunderstanding to a very large extent. It is the idea of "discipleship," or in German *Nachfolge Christi*. It was first Johannes Kühn who in his book, *Toleranz und Offenbarung*, 1923, described this type of *Nachfolge*, presenting Anabaptism on the one side and Quakerism on the other side as best representatives of this type of Christianity. Harold S. Bender then continued this thought both in his book on Grebel and in his paper, "Theology of Discipleship."²⁵ Such discipleship means that the commandment of Jesus Christ, "Take up thy cross and follow me" be taken absolutely seriously. That it implies separation from the world, non-conformity and consequently the narrow path which might end in martyrdom, is only too obvious. It is also obvious that all the other qualities previously discussed root in this central and most profound idea. Above all I am inclined to agree with Harold S. Bender that the church concept of the brethren, although one of the most distinctive features of Anabaptist life, is yet but a *derivative* idea, and can therefore not be called "the" essence of Anabaptism (as for instance Littell claimed). We have not yet arrived at the heart of the matter when we stop with the idea of the "church"; at the heart we discover one idea

only, and that is the idea of faithful and free, voluntary discipleship which the Anabaptist is resolved to accept without faltering. Discipleship and New Life mean about the same; that under this aspect a "theology of salvation" recedes somewhat into the background should not surprise us any longer.

It might, however, be argued that discipleship is merely a way and not a theology (as Bender claimed in his paper) and that therefore the same criticism could be raised against the term "theology of discipleship" which Bender himself offered against Stauffer's term "theology of martyrdom." Although there is some point to this argument we might yet interpret Bender's phrase in a way which makes it acceptable at once. What he had in mind was obviously the vision of a "theology" in which discipleship becomes a regulative or normative idea. Under this restriction his thesis becomes very fruitful although further specifications are still needed.

THE NATURE OF ANABAPTISM, A SUGGESTED REFORMULATION

Here then let us stop our survey. That it was not in vain will be readily admitted, likewise that it deals with most central Christian issues which go far beyond the interest in sectarian peculiarities. In brief, the issue posed by the Anabaptists is whether it is possible to realize such a life of discipleship or not, in other words whether Christ's commandment to follow him was meant for practical realization or only as a distant ideal hardly ever to be approximated within earthly life.

On this question the ways part. It is well known that Luther had his doubts whether a "brotherhood of committed disciples" is possible, or—neglecting a general church—is even desirable.²⁶ Thus he decided for a *Volkskirche* which would comprise both saints and sinners. The Anabaptists, on the other hand, decided exactly for the opposite way, that is for the "church holy" rather than for the "church universal" (Bainton's terms).²⁷ That such a "church holy" is not only a distant ideal but a distinct possibility for man was demonstrated by the Anabaptists, at least in their first period (to 1560), with much dedication and vigor. It meant, of course, complete separation from the world and non-conformity to it, with all the consequences implied. To embark upon this way was certainly not simple, but those who actually embarked did so out of a great "must" which genuine re-birth carries with it, no matter how high the price.

To give a dramatic picture of such an almost New Testamental conversion together with all its consequences, let us now briefly look at Professor Blanke's masterly description of the first Anabaptist congregation at Zollikon near Zurich.²⁸ On a January day 1525,

a peculiar incident happened near this place. At a public fountain two men stopped, and the one said to the other, "Well, Hans, you have taught me the Truth. For that I thank you, and request now the sign." The other man did not hesitate, and by sprinkling him with water from the fountain he performed the rite of Baptism on his companion. On the same evening a number of men assembled in the house of the one who had baptized his fellow-believer, and here they broke the bread together in a most simple and yet impressive communion service. Blanke calls this Lord's Supper an event which includes both the obligation to a Christian way of life, of love to God and to all fellow men, and a celebration of those who know that they are saved. There is nothing in these two acts, Baptism and Lord's Supper, which would make these men feel rebellious; in fact they proceeded with the greatest calm as if they had full authority to do so. Needless to say that there was nothing emotional in these acts either. The ordinances were to them symbols of grace, and of Divine grace they knew something ever since they had renounced their old life, sin and world. One of the men present but not yet baptized (into the new covenant) could not find sleep during that night. He knew no way out but to ask God to give him right understanding which finally broke upon him with convincing force. Early in the morning of the next day he got up, waked some brethren and engaged in a pastoral conversation the result of which was his baptism upon faith. They later reported that they all had prayed to God for recognition of sin. They knew that not only forgiveness of sin, but already the awareness of sin is a gift of God. Now these men went forth to become missionaries of their new faith and their new way. After a very short period they all stood before a court. Asked by the judge whether they would in future leave Anabaptism, one of them gave the following most revealing answer: "I am God's servant and have no longer authority over myself. I have enrolled under the captain Jesus Christ and would go to death with Him. Whatever He commands and reveals I would be obedient to and do the same." According to Blanke it was here in Zollikon that a new type of church had begun to differentiate itself, the Free-Church type.

This story is the earliest on record, if we omit the night event of a few days earlier when Conrad Grebel first baptized Jörg Blaurock in a room in Zurich, whereupon the latter baptized all the rest of those present. The same story repeats itself from now on time and again; with a high consciousness of authority, in an almost Gospel-like fashion, such new brotherhoods spring up everywhere, in Switzerland, South Germany, Austria, Tyrol, Moravia, and likewise in the North, in the Netherlands and adjoining German territories. The story of the

Austrian Hutterites is somewhat better known due to their two published *Chronicles* and needs no repetition here. Repentance, rebirth, baptism on faith, and a full dedication to a life of discipleship and obedience, . . . this sequence will be experienced henceforth in numberless cases throughout the sixteenth century.

As we now enter into the more systematic discussion of the nature of Anabaptism a number of questions suggest themselves which require analysis and clarification. First and foremost is the issue of Anabaptism and Pietism. Do not all these stories which we have heard sound almost like pietistic, methodistic, revivalistic events, only too well known from later periods both in Europe and in America? The only difference would be that these awakening-movements later on were no longer looked upon as dangerous, and therefore did not provoke persecutions. But could it not be, we ask, that this difference is due only to the fact that in the meanwhile a more tolerant mood had come up which allowed dissent without punishment? Or is there rather a difference "in kind" between the Anabaptist way of the sixteenth century and that of pietistic movements of later centuries? If we decide for the latter interpretation, then the burden is upon us to establish the specific difference between these two externally so similar phenomena. First we will readily admit that the temptation was always at hand to slip away from the narrow and difficult path of discipleship to the easier pietistic pattern. Pietism in a strict sense, to be sure, did not exist in the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, Caspar Schwenckfeld (who died in 1561, in the same year in which also Menno Simons died) is often termed as a "pietist before Pietism,"²⁹ and his type of Christian teaching ought to be considered in the present context. It is very significant that Schwenckfeld openly and in a most outspoken manner attacked the Anabaptists,³⁰ to which the brethren then passionately reacted, quite in contrast to their usual self-restraint. Pilgram Marpeck³¹ wrote an elaborate polemical book against him in 1542-3³² which most clearly states the differences. In the 47th chapter, for instance, we read: "He (Schwenckfeld) teaches but the inward and glorified Christ in Heaven, but not the suffering one on earth; he teaches but the word of his glory and magnificence, but not the word of his Cross and tribulation, as Christ had to bear before his ascension and as it is befitting to bear for his untransfigured body still today." Crown of Thorns (the symbol of the Anabaptist type of Christianity) and Halo of Glory (the symbol of the pietistic vision of Christianity); the "sweet Christ" as the ideal of the latter versus the "bitter Christ" as the ideal of the Anabaptists. In spite of great external similarities, a deep gulf seems to prevail which separates these two types.

The difference seems to center around the idea of man's sinfulness and the way of overcoming it. Pietism is principally characterized by the subjective experience of the fact that the sinner, though incapable of doing anything good, is yet saved through the atoning death of Christ, and the subsequent joy which goes with such an experience. The Pietist knows of his sinfulness, but in a struggle of repentance he overcomes it and now rejoices in his feeling of being saved and accepted by the Lord. A quiet moralism usually goes along with it together with a conventicle type of church life (which, by the way, is not the same as a brotherhood). The world, apparently, does not feel challenged or endangered by this attitude, and the result is the absence of persecution.

With the Anabaptists things seem to be quite different. The rebirth is a radical one, and with it the resolution to a new way in obedience to the "law of Christ." No conventicles but brotherhoods (*koinonias*) are established in order to build or to promote the Kingdom of God on earth. Once embarked on the path of obedience, little concern is shown regarding the question of one's own salvation. "We teach and try to establish the obedience of faith," writes Peter Walpot, a Hutterite bishop, around 1560, "and with it the true free and voluntary surrender unto God. Upon this we baptize" . . .³³ "Disobedience is the mother of all sins," writes succinctly Peter Riedemann, another Hutterite leader, around 1540. The brother who endeavors to be obedient does not worry any longer about his redeemed status. No rejoicing, therefore, is experienced in connection with man's awareness of salvation. In fact, very little theology on this point was ever developed by the brethren; their extensive writings are rather poor with regard to a theology of salvation. The reborn Anabaptist knows that so-called "inherent" (*anklebende*) sin still prevails in his body as a sort of inclination toward that which is not divine, and Riedemann teaches even that this kind of sin is the first cause of man's physical death. But he denies very outspokenly any total corruption which would make obedience to the Word of God impossible. Man, thus he claims, can resist evil and temptation to evil, can avoid sinful works and can die unto actual sin. Only by this way may he hope to follow Christ in true discipleship. "Sola-fide" theology hardly ever entered into his mind (at least not in the form which was taught by Luther), and therefore the enjoyment of the fruits of such justification (as in Pietism) is more or less foreign to him. It was only about one century later, when the basic attitude of the brethren became weakened or almost lost, that pietistic emotionalism took the place of the former *Nachfolge* or discipleship motive, and with this change (hardly ever noticed) the genuine Anabaptist spirit faded away.

Apparently, then, Anabaptism represents a new type of Christianity, different from the traditional patterns of Protestantism in general. It is certainly not a creedal (i.e. theological) church in which the idea of salvation takes the center of concern, nor is it a pietistic church in which the fruits of salvation may be enjoyed. Thus the question is not without meaning whether Anabaptism may still be considered as a part of the great Protestant family (aside from the merely negative fact of separation from Rome).³⁴ But in what other way then could this Anabaptist movement be classified or characterized, in order to give it its proper place in Church history?

Here I venture a new interpretation which might be quite helpful in the understanding of the movement even though it is not completely free of a certain vagueness. That is the interpretation of Anabaptism as an outstanding example of *existential Christianity*. This term is, of course, no longer new today. What is new at this place is perhaps only its application to the subject of our study. The term "existential" means here above all an extreme concreteness of the Christian experience. Such an experience is neither of an intellectual nature (doctrinal understanding) nor is it emotional. For lack of a better description we will call it "total," something most typical with all conversion experiences. In this total or concrete Christianity the distinctions between doctrine and ethics, belief and practice, no longer exist. Life becomes here a great "yes" to the call, something which goes far beyond both mere speculation and mere moralism. Spirituality and obedience become one and the same in such a Christian existence, an unre-served surrender and dedication to the divine will. That such Christian existence has also very little in common with emotionalism becomes likewise clear by now and should make us alert not to confound these two fundamentally different kinds of experience.

The best demonstration of this "existential" quality may perhaps be attained by an analysis of the phenomenon of faith, the very center of all Christianity. Faith may mean two very different things: trust or confidence on the one side, knowledge and vision on the other. With the main stream of Protestantism, faith is above all a trust, the confidence that God is true and that His promises therefore will come true. It is not mere chance that Harry E. Fosdick quotes Luther to demonstrate just this point. "Faith means not so much a believing about God as a lively, reckless confidence in the grace of God."³⁵ This gives the believer comfort and satisfaction. Man, to be sure, is and remains a sinner but at the same time he is also justified and reconciled in God by such faith alone.³⁶—With the Anabaptists faith appears to be of a different kind. It is less a trust than an awareness of a new, spiritual reality known only to the one who experienced an

inner birth or conversion. Here faith means a certain possession or a knowing, a new horizon and the acknowledgment of a call. The well-known formula, *simul justus ac peccator* is not shared by the Anabaptists, in fact it is very much against their particular understanding of the Christian message. To them faith and life are basically and very concretely one and the same: the believer simply cannot do otherwise than he is actually doing. No threat of martyrdom will influence him to deviate in any way.

A person who in this way has experienced something of the genuine Gospel-spirit becomes now a disciple in the most natural fashion; there is no other way possible to him. If we read any of the great testimonies of sixteenth century Anabaptism, this kind of genuineness and existential realism becomes apparent at once. With Paul these men could say, "Not I but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2:20). They would say it with greatest simplicity and without any sophistication, giving them a strange but obviously genuine charismatic authority.

Brotherly love is the most conspicuous sign of such an existential type of Christianity: where it is practiced we might also speak of a work at the Kingdom of God. It is obvious, moreover, that the Kingdom cannot exist for the "single one" in his isolation but only for those who have united in the *Koinonia*, the *Gemeinschaft* or *Gemeinde*. Earlier we called it the Fellowship of Committed Disciples. Kingdom-mindedness is a phenomenon not too often encountered in church-history. We might refer, however, to the Waldensians, or the Fraticelli (Franciscan Spirituals) as similar phenomena, perhaps also to the oldest form of the Bohemian Brethren whose spokesman was Peter Chelchitzki (1390-1460). In any case, this kingdom-mindedness works for group building, in fact it could not possibly actualize outside a group.³⁷ Only through genuine fellowship does the single one find his way to God. Thus the principle of love (*agape*) becomes here the very core of Christian existence, by resolving both theology and ethics into the new life of discipleship.

Existential Christianity and kingdom-mindedness are here suggested as new descriptive categories, differentiating Anabaptism from other forms of religious realization or expression. They both support the theory that discipleship is actually the essence of Anabaptism. It gave Anabaptism that concreteness and convincing power which made it so strong and capable to survive for so long. Rebirth belongs to it, too,³⁸ that inexplicable change in spiritual levels with its tremendous uplift, which enables the believer actually to walk the narrow path of following Christ. Thus the realization of love is no longer a mere paradox but something very much alive, the very norm of man's spiritual existence.

Quite naturally, this type of kingdom-mindedness produces also a new kind of eschatological thinking. The brethren are deeply aware of the co-existence of two worlds: this world and the world of the Kingdom. They understand without much explanation "the inbreaking miracle of the eschatological order," as Rudolf Otto³⁹ calls it, that is of the Kingdom here and now. Absolute separation from the world and non-conformity to it easily follow as corollaries. Occasionally we read in Anabaptist tracts phrases like this, "In these latter and dangerous days . . .," but almost nowhere do we find apocalyptic speculations.⁴⁰ Their eschatology is strictly evangelical: the Christian has "to fight the good fight" (I Tim. 6:12), and to prevail over the great Enemy, the Tempter; in other words, he has to resist sin with all his strength. Discipline and the Ban are but two means to this end within the brotherhood. That such an attitude very tangibly challenged or provoked the world at large is quite evident, and the brethren recognized it as their fate that love and cross always go together. In this connection, a quotation from Sebastian Franck, the sixteenth century spiritual reformer, is very revealing. In his *Chronica und Geschichtsbibel* of 1531, he writes about these brethren as follows: "They taught nothing but love, faith and the cross. They showed themselves humble and patient under much suffering. They brake bread with one another as an evidence of unity and love. . . . And they died as martyrs, patiently and humbly enduring all persecution."⁴¹

Another term of great significance in Anabaptist thought is "obedience." An early Anabaptist tract expressly emphasized this thought by distinguishing between "childlike obedience in freedom," and "servile (*knechtisch*) obedience" which but leads to false legalism. This tract, a letter of 1571 by a Hutterite bishop to a Unitarian inquirer in Poland, offers a fine example of this obedience-motive. He begins by quoting Paul (II Cor. 10:5), "Bring your reason into the captivity of the obedience of Christ." In this spirit he continues, "We establish the obedience of faith. . . . The servant who knows his Lord's will is obliged not to stand around too long but to go ahead and to do it." Obedience and faith become here almost identical terms. "Mere knowledge and learning," he assures us, "are not enough. Those who claim to believe have first to be tested and proved through tribulation, etc. Hold fast to God and look out to Him with a humble and staunch heart."⁴² That is typical Anabaptist style. As can be readily seen there is nothing emotional in it and nothing sophisticated. It is rather a spiritual realism which knows of the difference of the two worlds.

Obedience then is the Anabaptist term for "discipleship." They would not often speak of the latter but simply insist upon the former. They do not worry whether such obedience and discipleship are

actually possible or not. Did not Paul himself speak of "the obedience unto righteousness" (Romans 6:16)? It requires but the right commitment and the right fellowship.

Two ordinances help to strengthen these two, and they are Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Baptism they call occasionally with Paul "the bath of rebirth" (Tim. 3:5, acc. to Luther). It is understood as a most solemn event. It does not bestow graces upon the receiver but means rather a sealing (*Versiegelung*) of the new life and commitment. In character such baptism might perhaps best be compared with a monastic vow. Whosoever demanded baptism upon faith and, after due inquiry, received it, will no longer deviate from his new path. Basically it means the determination to resist sin in all its subtle temptations. As a pre-supposition, however, the brethren taught a genuinely felt self-surrender unto God, in German, *Gelassenheit* (self-abandoning, yieldedness), the very qualification for the entrance into the new covenant of grace.

Once this stage is reached, the brother is accepted at the Lord's Table. Franz Heimann in his earlier mentioned dissertation states quite correctly that such a "Unity of the fellowship of the Lord's Table must exist *prior* to the celebration of the Lord's Supper proper."⁴³ This concept of a "Fellowship of the Lord's Table" (*abendmahls-gemeinde*) is very helpful indeed, symbolizing the close inner relatedness and unity of all brethren within the group. It is much more than a mere "assembly of saints" (as for instance in pietistic conventicles), and might best be considered as an expression of "the unity of the spirit in love and faith." At the celebration of the Lord's Supper the brethren liked to recite the old parable of bread and wine, first mentioned in the *Teachings of the Twelve Apostles* (the "Didache") of about 120 A.D. In one of our texts it runs about as follows:

As the grain kernels are altogether merged and each must give its content into the one flour and bread, likewise also the wine, where the single grapes are crushed under the press and each grape gives away all its juice and all its strength into one wine. Whichever kernel and whichever grape, however, is not crushed and retains its strength for itself alone, such an one is unworthy and is cast out. This is what Christ wanted to bring home to his companions and guests at the Last Supper as an example of how they should be together in such a fellowship.⁴⁴

That from such an experience of unity occasionally a sort of communion of goods resulted should not surprise us any longer. With the Hutterites it was a full communion of both consumption and production (as in monasteries), with the other groups it was what Troeltsch called a "communion of love," a sharing in that which was needed.

This Lord's Supper was of course a most solemn affair, like Baptism, and it was often celebrated under greatest dangers at some

remote mountain glens or forest retreats, quite often at night. When we consider the meaning of the original Supper in the Upper Room and compare it with these Anabaptist ceremonies, we are at once impressed by the similarity of the spirit. According to Rudolf Otto, the original supper was "a consecrated meal of a fellowship of religious brethren. . . . It was a fraternal meal with sacramental character, a real sharing in the means of expiation. The meaning of this meal was definitely eschatological: the experience of the eschatological order itself here and now. By participating in this meal a power was experienced which released the members from the burden of guilt and made them aware of the miracle of atonement."⁴⁵ The parallels with the Lord's Supper and its interpretation among Anabaptists is at once striking. I would, however, not call these parallels "primitivism" as has been done (though there is something of it apparent) but rather the result of a unique similarity of the basic spiritual experiences.

The brethren never developed binding creeds, and this is another feature typical for this type of Christianity. Our sources abound in "Confessions of Faith," "Accounts of our Religion," and the like. But these statements are no creeds in the conventional ecclesiastical sense; they are rather personal documents, testimonies so to speak, which every brother produced for himself. Their existential character is recognized by the frequent introduction, "This I do confess" or "This we do believe." That such confessions were never binding for the group as a whole, and likewise not conducive to the establishment of ecclesiastical bodies, is readily understandable. These testimonies are usually very simple, abounding in Bible quotations and short declarations. Theology was not intended and will hardly be found in them. Nevertheless, these documents are of a very high standard, and regularly surprised interrogating commissions, judges or priests bent on the conversion of brethren held in prison. The way in which these brethren bore their trials and defended their faith with dignity and expertness is truly amazing. It might be considered as another evidence of the existential nature of Anabaptist Christianity, and also of the vitality of their Gospel-spirit.

And finally the church. Is its meaning that of a "church universal" comprising saints and sinners, or is its meaning to be a "church holy" whose light shines on the hill?⁴⁶ Peter Riedemann in 1540 had this to answer: "The church is a lantern of righteousness in which the light of grace is borne and held before the whole world. The true church is completely filled with the light of Christ in the same way as the lantern is illuminated and made bright by the light in it."⁴⁷ Those who live in it as true members not only experience salvation as "liberation from sin" but also as a new covenant of grace, or, as it

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

was occasionally called, as a "covenant of child-like freedom." This remarkable self-interpretation agrees, of course, also very well with our earlier more sociological interpretation according to which the church was understood as a "fellowship of committed disciples."

As we now look back to our analysis, it becomes rather clear that all the features discussed in the first section fit beautifully to these *new descriptive categories* such as: existential Christianity, kingdom-mindedness, discipleship, obedience, and fellowship of the Lord's Table. Theology of martyrdom, Christian primitivism, restitution of the church, sanctification of life, . . . they all round up one and the same picture. That this picture is quite different from that of the state churches (in Europe) or from that of the large denominational bodies (in America) becomes evident at once. It explains also the great difficulty of mutual understanding and appreciation. It might, perhaps, bring us somewhat further in this endeavor if we apply the new typology suggested earlier in this paper, namely the distinction between creedal (theological), pietistic and existential Christianity.

1. Robert Friedmann, "Conception of an Anabaptist," *Church History*, 1940, 341-364.
2. In *Church History*, 1944.
3. Pub. by The Mennonite Historical Society, Goshen, Indiana, 1949.
4. Harold S. Bender, *Conrad Grebel, 1498-1526, The Founder of the Swiss Brethren, Sometimes Called Anabaptists*, The Mennonite Historical Society, Goshen, Indiana, 1950.
5. *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, January 1950 (contains: C. Krahn, "Prolegomena to an Anabaptist Theology," R. Friedmann, "Anabaptism and Protestantism," H. S. Bender, "The Anabaptist Theology of Discipleship," Franklin H. Littell, "The Anabaptist Doctrine of the Restitution of the True Church," L. Verduin, "Menno Simons Theology Reviewed," John C. Wenger, "The Doctrinal Position of the Swiss Brethren as revealed in their polemical tracts," Don E. Smucker, "Anabaptist Theology in the Light of Modern Theological Trends").
6. Pub. by Mennonite Publishing House, Scottsdale, Pa., 1950.
7. Franklin H. Littell, *The Anabaptist View of the Church, an Introduction to Sectarian Protestantism*, American Society of Church History, 1952.
8. In *Menn. Quart. Review*, XXVI, 1952, 22-47, 142-160.
9. Pub. by J. G. Oncken Verlag, Kassel, Germany, 1952.
10. H. S. Bender, "Anabaptist Manuscripts in the Archive at Brno, Czechoslovakia," *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, 1949, 105 ff.
11. Fritz Blanke, "Zollikon 1525, Die Entstehung der ältesten Täufergemeinde," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, Basel, VIII, 1952, 241-261; English trans. in *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, Jan. 1953, 17-33.
12. In *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 1953, 32-51.
13. Frank J. Wray in an unpublished 1953 Yale Dissertation, "History as seen through the eyes of Sixteenth Century Anabaptists" has also a good chapter on the Free Will issue.—The theology of atonement in Anabaptist understanding is very well represented in an early anonymous tract, "Concerning the Satisfaction of Christ," translated and edited by John C. Wenger, *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, XX, 1946, 243-254.
14. In *Menn. Quart. Rev.* XXVIII, 1954, 5-26, 128-142.
15. In *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, 1954, 27-38.
16. Roland H. Bainton, "The Left Wing of the Reformation," *Journal of Religion*, 1941, 127.
17. The idea of "restitution" within the Left-Wing of the Reformation was for the first time discussed by Roland H. Bainton in his study, "Changing Ideas and Ideals in the Sixteenth Century," *Journal of Modern History*, VIII, 1936, 417-443.
18. Frank J. Wray, "The Anabaptist Doctrine of the Restitution of the Church," *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, July 1954, 186-196.
19. In a letter to this writer, Roland H. Bainton makes a fine differentiation

concerning this principle of Restitution. "The ideal of restitution or restoration was common in the age of Reformation, and all parties desired to restore something. The difference was only as to what, and how far back to go. Luther wished to restore the church of the early Middle Ages; for him the great corruption was the rise of the temporal power of the papacy in the eighth century. The Anabaptists went back further than any of the other groups, and turned exclusively to the New Testament. Even within the New Testament they tended to neglect Paul and to push back to Jesus. That is why the ideal of Restoration tends to coincide with the ideal of the imitation of Christ."

20. According to Luther's translation.
21. R. Friedmann, "Peter Riedemann on Original Sin and the Way of Redemption," *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, 1952, 214.
22. *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, 1952, 43 (in the study quoted in note 8). Compare also the excellent study of Wilhelm Wiswedel, "The Inner and the Outer Word, A Study in the Anabaptist Doctrine of Scripture," *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, XXVI, 1952, 171-191.
23. Ethelbert Stauffer, "Täufertheologie und Märtyrertum," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LII, 1933, 545-598; English trans. "The Anabaptist Theology of Martyrdom," *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, XIX, 1945, 179-214.
24. A copy of the pamphlet in Goshen College Library. Comp. the article "Faber (Fabri)" by Neff in *Menn. Lex.*, I, 1913, 624.
25. Harold S. Bender, "The Theology of Discipleship," *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, XXIV, 1950, 25-32.
26. Luther, *Deutsche Messe, Werke, W. A.*, XIX, 75; compare also Albrecht Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, I, Bonn, 1880, 73, and Roland H. Bainton, "The Development and Consistency of Luther's Attitude toward Religious Liberty," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXII, 1929, 130-1.
27. See note 16.
28. See note 11.
29. Joachim Wach, "Caspar Schwenckfeld, a pupil and a teacher in the school of Christ," in his *Types of Religious Experience, Christian and Non-Christian*, Chicago, 1951, 135-170, in particular note 19.
30. Karl Eicke, *Schwenckfeld, Luther und der Gedanke einer Apostolischen Reformation*, Berlin, 1911, and by the same author, *Caspar Schwenckfeld*, Stuttgart, 1952 (a brief condensation of the earlier book). Both books deal extensively with Schwenckfeld's reaction to the Anabaptist way. He calls the Anabaptists false apostles for "they do not know the true way of salvation, and have no living experience of salvation. . . . They know little of sin and forgiving grace [i.e. of the *sola-fide* theology]. They do not know anything essential about man's basic corruption and do not teach the power of sin. Hence they are ignorant of the true justifying faith. They have an unbiblical genius of judging and self-righteousness (*Richtgeist*), and show spiritual arrogance. The sacraments they dispose with lightly. Marpeck in particular has a very superficial judgment concerning original sin and salvation. In short: the Anabaptists represent a new type of Judaism [i.e. legalism], etc., etc." These remarks show impressively that Schwenckfeld was unable to grasp the genius of Anabaptism, due most likely to his own "sola-fide" approach, and they show at the same time the deep gulf between the latter and the Anabaptist vision. It was much easier for a spiritual reformer like Sebastian Franck to appreciate the positive qualities of Anabaptism without, however, ever identifying himself with it.
31. Cpr. John C. Wenger, "Pilgram Marpeck, Tyrolese Engineer and Anabaptist Elder," *Church History*, IX, 1940, 24-36.
32. *Pilgram Marbecks Antwort auf Kaspar Schwenckfelds Beurteilung des Buches der Bundesbezeugung von 1542*, Herausgegeben von Johann Loserth (under the heading: *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Oberdeutschen Taufgesinntheit des 16. Jahrhunderts*), Vienna and Leipzig, 1929; a volume of nearly 600 pages in folio. The 47th chapter on p. 153-162.
33. Quoted by R. Friedmann, *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 1931, 109.
34. R. Friedmann, "Anabaptism and Protestantism," *Menn. Quart. Rev.* 1950, 14.
35. Harry Emerson Fosdick, *Great Voices of the Reformation*, New York, 1952, 542.
36. A good illustration of this situation may be also drawn from the following Luther quotation, "When God speaks and gives signs [sacraments], man must firmly and wholeheartedly believe that what God says and signifies is true. . . . Then God, in turn, will count this faith unto our righteousness, good and sufficient to salvation." Martin Luther, *Works*, ed. Jacobs, Philadelphia, III, 20f.
37. It is true that also the Pietists speak of promoting the Kingdom of God but it seems to me that their idea of the Kingdom is rather of a sentimental (non-"existential") nature. We meet here a similar difference in shade (perhaps in kind) as with the contradiction of conventicle and *koinonia*, the Anabaptist brotherhood. The dif-

- ference, however, is too subtle to be discussed in a brief footnote.
38. What in Biblical terminology is called "rebirth" (John 3:3), Kierkegaard calls "the leap," that is the sudden change in spiritual levels.
 39. Compare Rudolf Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, London, 1943 (German 1932) p. 312, a book which helped me greatly to understand not only the apostolic church but also the Anabaptist genius with its great inner kinship to that apostolic church.
 40. The only exception from this general rule is perhaps Melchior Hofmann (1495-1543), the beginner of evangelical Anabaptism in the Netherlands. Tragically he saw all his expectations come to naught. He died after many years of imprisonment in Strassburg. See Neff's article in *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, II, 326-335.
 41. "Two kinds of obedience, An Anabaptist tract on Christian Freedom," translated and edited by John C. Wenger, *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, XXI, 1947, 18-22; also in H. E. Foslick, *op cit.*, 296-299.
 42. R. Friedmann, "Reason and Obedience: an old Anabaptist letter of Peter Walpot, 1571, and its meaning," *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, XIX, 1945, 27-40.
 43. See note 8.
 44. Andreas Ehrenpreis, *Ein Sendbrief . . .*, 1652, (reprinted Scottdale, Pa., 1920). Menno Simons has a similar quotation, cf. Cornelius Krahn, *Menno Simons*, Karlsruhe, 1936, 142. It is noteworthy that also Martin Luther once quoted this parable, in his 1519 sermon "Von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament des heiligen wahren Leichnams Christi," yet without further applications. Most remarkably, this parable is still today in use among the Old Order Amish in their communion sermons.
 45. Rudolf Otto, *loc. cit.* (note 43), 312.
 46. Roland H. Bainton, see above note 16.
 47. *Mennonite Quart. Rev.*, 1952, 37 (in the article quoted in note 8).

AMERICAN MISSIONARIES IN GREECE: 1820-1869

THEODORE SALOUTOS, *University of California, Los Angeles*

A lesser known but perhaps significant phase of American religious reformism manifested itself beginning with the eighteen twenties when missionaries attempted to graft Protestantism on Greek soil. These spiritual reformers prepared to plant their faith in Greece while Samuel Gridley Howe, Jonathan P. Miller, and George Jarvis sought to help the Greeks win their independence from the Turks. This phase of missionary activity represented something extraordinary, because the Americans were attempting to impose their kind of Christianity on a people who had been Christians centuries before America was discovered. The obstacles the missionaries faced in the process were almost insurmountable; still they believed they could overcome these and restore "the light" that had been banished from the stricken land. The Americans, in their less humble moments, had little doubt in their minds about the superiority of their particular beliefs, and overlooked the likelihood that the Greeks might rebel against an alien religion that ran counter to the best traditions of "faith and nationality."¹

It is difficult to explain precisely what motivated these missionaries other than their determination to propagate the gospel. They probably had imbibed much of the idealism of the revolutionary and post-revolutionary generation, and were convinced of the divineness of their faith. After the War of 1812 this religious enthusiasm was reinforced by an aggressive young nationalism, an optimistic outlook, a sense of self-righteousness, and a headstrong determination "to preach the gospel in the heathen world."² Besides Greece, American representatives were to preach in far away India, the Sandwich Islands, the Ottoman Empire, and the lands of Africa.³

The American churches gave serious thought to preaching the gospel to the people of the crumbling Ottoman Empire, of which the Greeks were a part, as early as 1820; when reformers in the United States were concerned with saving lost souls, banishing slavery, curbing the drink habit, encouraging public education, and introducing more humane methods in treating criminals and the insane.⁴ In American eyes the Greeks ranked high among those deserving to be saved; they were the offspring of Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, and other ancient greats, and the missionaries believed they owed it to civilization to help restore the Greeks to the good graces of society.⁵ The Greeks were considered especially ripe for Christian endeavors owing to their

religiosity and interest in reading; and because the Americans wanted the satisfaction of returning to this ancient land "the inestimable blessings, which were derived from thence, . . ."⁶

The Congregational, the Protestant Episcopal, and the Baptist Churches entered the Greek field, but the Congregational Church, through the leadership of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) became the most active in the eastern Mediterranean. This ambition to export religious reformism was a novel departure. The Americans were new in the field, had few experiences to draw upon for guidance, and faced numerous challenges in dealing with people of foreign cultures. The big motivating force was the desire "to preach to the heathen;" little else seemed to matter.⁷

When the revolt against the Turks broke out in 1821, the Greeks of the Peloponnesus and continental Greece, Crete, the Cyclades, the Ionian Islands, Constantinople, the maritime towns, the trans-Danubian provinces, and other areas numbered about three and a half million. The strength behind the revolution however lay in "the Peloponnesus, in continental Greece, and in the Greek Islands," where the Greeks possessed some municipal authority, where the Orthodox Church was influential, and a considerable part of the land was under cultivation.⁸

Following the outbreak of hostilities, the Greek Church severed its ties with the Patriarch in Constantinople and pursued an independent course. There was no other alternative; the Patriarch was subservient to the Sultan, and it was impossible for the revolting Greeks to recognize him. The ecclesiasts with much justification have been accused of exaggerating their effectiveness in keeping alive the spirit of nationalism during the centuries of Ottoman rule. But in the minds of the Greeks faith and nationality were inevitably intertwined; and it was difficult for them to conceive of one as being a Greek without at the same time being a communicant of the Orthodox Church. The dramatic role assumed by many priests in overthrowing the Turks tended to confirm this. During the early hours of the revolution the clergy plotted against the Moslem foe and took an active part in the fighting. Many priests became soldiers and some captains. Following the fall of Kalamata in 1821 the clergy and civilians joined the thanksgiving services held in the fields to commemorate the success of Greek arms. "Twenty-four priests officiated, and five thousand armed men stood around. Never was *Te Deum* celebrated with greater fervor, never did the hearts overflow with sincerer devotion to Heaven, nor with warmer gratitude to their Church and their God . . ." The attitude the Greek Church adopted toward the missionaries was of crucial importance to the success of their endeavors.⁹

Besides the Church, the missionaries had to contend with the

conservative peasants who when aroused could be converted into violent adversaries. Most Greeks were peasants steeped in age-old traditions and customs, lacking in education, and suspicious of innovations. Could these people have been expected to renounce a faith that was as old as Christianity itself, and which during the darkest hours of Ottoman rule had helped preserve their spirit and language? Or was it that the religious zeal of the missionaries had blinded them to the realities of the situation, especially to the powerful forces of nationalism?¹⁰

The Greek language created another serious problem. Modern Greek was radically different from the English; still the Americans had to learn it if they wanted to launch this spiritual undertaking. Most missionaries had a classroom knowledge of the ancient and New Testament Greek which was helpful in reading the Scriptures; but use of the academic or Erasmian pronunciation in place of the vernacular could prove very prejudicial when working with a proud and nationalistic people who believed that their spoken language was the correct one.¹¹

There seems to have been some uncertainty as to what the short and long-range objectives of the missionaries were. In the beginning the feeling on the part of the missionaries was that the majority of the Greeks were unprepared intellectually and emotionally for anything as revolutionary as the Protestant Reformation; however on occasions, if one took some of their comments seriously, such radical goals were hardly strange to their thoughts. But in general this represented a passing instead of a lasting phase. Only a few of the better informed Greeks had heard of Martin Luther and his works; and except for isolated speculative utterances here and there, there was little conclusive evidence that the missionaries contemplated planting the seeds of a Reformation in Greece.¹²

The first missionaries the American Board sent to work with the Greeks and other people in the Near East were Pliny Fisk and Levy Parsons, graduates of Middlebury College and Andover Theological Seminary. These men began their work in a mild and innocuous manner to prevent opposition from developing against their teachings. Besides distributing religious tracts, treatises, and translations of the New Testament in the modern languages they encouraged the young to commit to memory passages from the Scriptures. For instance, a youth of twelve memorized the entire Gospel of St. Matthew; and two or three others committed about half of it to memory within progress of their work, but complained they toiled many hours to learn a period of twelve weeks. The missionaries expressed pleasure with the a difficult language and thus limited their usefulness.¹³

Fisk was convinced that Greece offered fertile soil for missionary work, and urged his superiors to establish a station there. In the process he outlined what he believed were the weaknesses and the redeeming qualities of the people which prompted his recommendations. ". . . for though nominal Christians, they [the Greeks] pay an idolatrous regard to pictures, holy places and saints. Their clergy are ignorant in the extreme. Out of the hundreds, you will scarcely find one who is capable of preaching a sermon. . . . The people are consequently ignorant and vicious. . . . Nor should it be forgotten that the Greek church is intimately connected with the predominant church in the immense and rising empire of Russia—and has more or less direct or indirect influence upon all oriental churches—Armenian, Syrian, Nestorian, Coptic, and Abyssinian." But the Greeks, backward and poverty-stricken as they were, possessed "many excellent materials." These included a "powerful intellect, lively imagination, zeal, energy, enterprise, enthusiasm, love of learning, and liberty, which four centuries of slavery [had] not been able to destroy, and [an] earnest desire for civilization, a remembrance of what their fathers were, and the hope of being what England and America now are. . . ."

Fisk also stressed practical reasons why a mission was advisable. He believed the Greek Church was receptive to a missionary program because it permitted the distribution of religious tracts, which the Papists did not; and also because the authorities had encouraged the work of the Bible societies, and allowed them access to schools and convents. Rarely did the Americans face opposition. Fisk believed the revolution had set the stage for religious reform. "The nation is roused—the elements of national and individual character are all in motion. An impression, a turn of public opinion, the commencement of institutions which at another time would require years, might now be effected at once." The Greeks were "prejudiced in favor" of the Americans "and strongly so in preference to every other nation on earth except the English." Fisk was moved by the thought of being able to preach in Corinth, Thessalonica, or from within sight of Mt. Parnassus, and asked "how ought a Christian from America . . . feel at the thought of introducing Christianity into . . . Greece, at the very commencement of its political existence."¹⁴

The American Board early devised an educational program calculated to bring schooling opportunities to Greek children, introduce American methods into this eastern Mediterranean area, and perhaps win converts to the Congregational faith.

A novel part of the Board program consisted of bringing promising boys to the United States for a formal education. The purpose of this was to acquaint them with American institutions and demonstrate

"the plain and powerful teachings of the Gospel." After completing their formal studies, the hope was that the boys would return to their native land and contribute to the mental and moral regeneration of Greece. But this was merely the beginning and not the end. Others were to follow in their footsteps, also to "enjoy the same means of intellectual and moral improvement . . . enjoyed by the most highly favored young men of our own country" and thus multiply the blessings to be rendered the liberated people. The "generous philanthropic heart" will "beat strong with exultation, at the thought of contributing to raise the fallen, to befriend the oppressed, in the most effectual and least exceptional manner, and to aid in forming the character of men, who may be lights to all of their countrymen."

This educational program began with earnestness in 1823 when two boys reached this country to start their studies. One of these was Photus Kavasales, thirteen or fourteen years of age, and a native of the Island of Hydra. He had been committed to the care of Pliny Fisk by an uncle who wanted him to obtain an education in America that "should fit him for extensive usefulness among his countrymen." The other boy, Anastasius Karavelles, eleven years old and a native of Zante, was the son of a Greek priest.¹⁵

Six more youths reached the United States in 1824. Two of the arrivals were Stephano and Panteleon Galati, who escaped with members of their family from war-torn Chios, an island off the coast of Asia Minor, by making their way first to the Peloponnesus and then to Malta where they boarded a vessel for this country. The other four—Constantino and Pandias Ralli, Nicola Petrokokino and Alessandro Paspatis—encountered similar and in some respects more tragic experiences. These six boys were placed in schools in Connecticut and Massachusetts with the earlier arrivals, the expenses for their education being paid by "friends" of the cause. From an American standpoint, the most important of the young arrivals was Evangelos Evangelides Sophocles who reached the country in 1828, later became a professor of Greek in Harvard University and distinguished himself as a man of letters.¹⁶

Still another phase of the Board's program consisted of exploring the possibilities of establishing schools on the Greek mainland, the Aegean islands, and in Asia Minor. The missionaries visited schools to determine their condition, the kind of textbooks that would be most suited for their use, and to devise ways for introducing these books once they were prepared. These schools were sponsored either by the church or individuals who sought self-employment as teachers. The church school usually was small and entrusted to a parish priest who stressed the rapid reading of the ancient language, "with all the peculiar

tones and modulations which [were] deemed so essential in both the Greek and Roman churches." Most schools however, were established by enterprising young men and a few females who charged about three dollars a year for their instructions. Classes were held in "small, dark, dirty apartments" which lacked modern conveniences. The children usually were seated "cross-legged" on the floor from where they learned the "three Rs." Books were scarce. About the only ones required were "a small first book for children, and the psalter, both in ancient Greek, badly printed, and on very coarse paper, . . ." The learning was mechanical; there was no incentive to think. Even if the school masters wanted to introduce better methods of instruction and fresh subject matter, they were barred from doing so because the Ottoman authorities forbade instruction in mathematics and the physical sciences. Most villages had private schools of this type; and in the Peloponnesus they were kept open during the war years. In 1827 Smyrna had 31 such schools in session with an enrollment of about 1000 pupils, consisting chiefly of boys under twelve years of age.¹⁷

The missionaries realized the need for a printing press from the outset to make available textbooks for the schools and tracts for the masses. The former was accomplished with relative ease, but the latter proved difficult because the missionaries wanted their religious publications circulated in modern Greek. The teachings of the early church fathers, which they wanted translated into the vernacular, were available only in the ancient language which the masses did not understand. This placed the missionaries in a delicate position because they realized ancient Greek was as sacred to the people as Hebrew was to the Jews, and they might resist innovations made by foreigners. Still the feeling persisted that these translations had to be made if the mission was to function.¹⁸

Once Jerusalem was considered a likely place to locate the press but this was overruled in favor of Smyrna, which was within easier reach of the Ottoman Empire, furnished better opportunities for learning, and also offered greater security and liberty for the foreigners. However, Malta became the printing press headquarters for the American Board missionaries and for those from other nations; the outbreak of the war and the fact that it was an English possession made the island a safer base from which to operate.¹⁹

Down to 1828-1829 the Greeks seemed receptive to the work of the missionaries; they gave few signs of having been offended by the distribution of religious tracts. If they [the Greeks] objected, there certainly was no organized central authority in existence capable of resisting the Americans. In fact all indications were that the missionaries were to have freedom of action. In 1828 the Reverend Jonas

King, who went to Greece to carry on the work started by Fisk and Parsons, was welcomed by Count Capodistrias, the President of Greece, and furnished with a personal guard to visit the Morea. Capodistrias, he said, was receptive to having the Americans establish schools. King, in his enthusiasm, observed that "few [Greeks] asked for charity, but hundreds asked for books." Perhaps this was true, but neither the Greeks nor King revealed just what kind of books they wanted. His coming to Greece marked the beginning of a startling new and militant epoch in the Board program.²⁰

King was new neither to missionary work nor to the eastern Mediterranean area to which he was assigned. Reared in a strict Puritan home and educated in Williams College and Andover, he was a determined and energetic person. He had worked briefly as a missionary among negroes and seamen in Charleston, South Carolina, before going to the Near East. A student of Arabic, King was persuaded by Fisk, his former seminary mate, to join the Near East mission of the American Board. A linguist of some ability, he travelled extensively in the Mediterranean countries where he preached, won converts, distributed literature, and solicited funds. In 1827 he returned to the United States and aroused considerable interest among his colleagues and supporters. He was appointed agent of a New York committee to raise money for missionary work. He visited a few of the principal cities of New York and later travelled in "the southern and middle states." After hearing of the Greek victory in the Battle of Navarino and the destruction of the Egyptian fleet, King surmised that the Near East would soon "open up to freedom and true religion," and he felt it his duty to return to the missionary field. In 1828 King, after deciding to go to Greece, was asked by a group of ladies in New York City to help distribute the relief supplies they had collected and also to engage in evangelical labors in behalf of their committee. King agreed to serve as agent for this society; the belief was that some good might be gained from perfecting this arrangement. In July 1828 King landed in Malta from where he proceeded to his destination.²¹

Shortly, King found himself a part of a broader program. In 1829 Dr. Rufus Anderson, the Assistant Secretary of the Foreign Department of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, went to Malta to confer with the missionaries who had congregated there after the fighting had compelled them to retire from their posts in Beirut, Smyrna, and Constantinople. Anderson's purpose was to explore the possibilities of reviving and reinforcing missionary activities in the eastern Mediterranean. After completing his work there, he visited the Peloponnesus, and several of the islands in the Cyclades

group, including Syra, Tenos, Andros, Mykonos, and Delos. He also talked with President Capodistrias who expressed himself freely on the subject of schools.²²

Anderson outlined a plan to the President by which friends of the cause in the United States would help establish and support schools. This program called for forming Lancastrian schools, which would use portions of the Scriptures as reading lessons, and the exercising of regular supervision by an agent of the Board. This seemed agreeable to Capodistrias, who confided that he already had applied for a loan from the Society for Elementary Instruction at Paris, but who likewise expressed doubt over accepting the gratuitous aid Anderson suggested. However, he was willing to accept assistance from the Americans on the qualified basis of a loan.

Capodistrias, in response to this offer, addressed an official letter to Anderson on the general subject of education, the kind of books he believed should be used in Greece—the Bible being among those recommended for the common schools—and formally applied for a loan from the Board as he had done from the French society. The Board, sensing a deep obligation to come to the aid of “liberated Greece,” decided to give special attention to publishing modern Greek works that would be serviceable in the schools. All such books had to have in them “a good proportion of moral and religious truth.” The next step was to make King head of the Board agency.²³

King had given thought to establishing schools in Greece as early as 1827 or 1828, before receiving his last assignment from the Board. He wanted to found a first-rate college or university in Athens that would be staffed by men famous for their learning; and he interested a few wealthy friends in New York to help finance it. In 1829 he helped start a common school on the Island of Poros; and others of a similar type soon followed. He was living on the Island of Tenos where he was supervising a school for females when he was designated agent and missionary for the American Board.²⁴

The missionaries weighed the possibilities of success and failure from the very outset. They believed that the circulation of books and the founding of schools offered the best means for working with the people in the beginning; because according to the missionaries, the Greeks were “ignorant,” “superstitious,” and excitable; and this procedure lent itself less to suspicion than did any other. The Greek government was unstable; but the Board believed that this instability was counterbalanced by other encouraging signs. The rich experiences that King had in the field, his deep concern for the Mediterranean people, the interest he aroused among his admirers in the United States were reassuring. Even more gratifying was the news that the

"three great powers" had "established the principle of religious toleration" in Greece. The Board expected great events to proceed from the Greek revolution, and that these would "have an ultimate bearing on the diffusion of religious knowledge and the establishment of Christ's kingdom."²⁵

King was a man of positive views and one who had the courage of his convictions. Once before King penned a "Farewell Letter To His Friends in Palestine and Syria" in which he defended his evangelical faith and explained why he could never become a Roman Catholic. Although he stressed the differences between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, adherents of the Eastern Churches detected that much of this same criticism was directed at them as well as the Roman Catholics. On other occasions, he pointed to signs which indicated that the Greeks were prepared for a religious revolution. He knew of "well-informed" Greeks who questioned dogmas, the prevalence of inquiring minds, the general skepticism that prevailed, and the felt need for checking infidelity among the young. If "the yoke of the oppressor" on earth was broken, as one of his contemporaries wrote, "the [Greek] captive freed," why not also unhitch him from dogmas and free him spiritually? For a time King was convinced that a religious reformation could follow in the path of a political revolution in Greece, if it was properly organized.²⁶

Soon welcome turned into hostility; the Greeks proved to be as headstrong and determined in their convictions as King was in his. Among the first rebuffs King faced were those on the Island of Tenos where he conducted his female school. The principal town on the island was the site of "the Evangelistra," a modern church, which was built during the revolutionary struggle. This church soon became a shrine; hundreds of pilgrims—"the lame, the sick, and the lunatics"—visited it annually to be cured. On the island, there also were communicants of the Roman Catholic faith, who, according to King, totalled about one-third the inhabitants.

King faced opposition after the first few months. The trustees of the shrine, he claimed, were in league with the "Roman bishop" and sought to destroy his school, which counted among its pupils the daughters of some of the prominent townspeople. One of his teachers who was dependent on the trustees of the "Evangelistra" was compelled to retire; and the books King used in the school were denounced as heretical. Sentiment, however, was divided; some supported and others attacked him; and many expressed gratitude for making books available for the pupils. But the Greek bishop of Tenos objected to the circulation of the modern version of the New Testament, and his influence was felt.²⁷

Once the Turks evacuated Athens King made the city his headquarters. He revisited Athens in 1831 when he started a Lancasterian school for pupils of both sexes. He supplied the pupils with slates, pencils, and books from the press in Malta, and hoped to extend these same supplies to schools in Attica and in other parts of continental Greece. As yet, he had not relinquished his plan to establish a college in Athens.

Another missionary, a Dr. C. L. Korck of Bremen, who had been trained in the Missionary Institute of Basel, was in charge of education in Syra, another of the islands in the Cyclades. In 1831 three missionary schools were reported functioning there; they were outgrowths of the one established in 1828 by the Reverend Josiah Brewer under the auspices of the Board. Korck severed his associations with the boy's Lancasterian school because of "the bad disposition of the ungrateful [Greek] master of it." He objected to the modifications the government made in a school manual, changes which probably were required because of "the difference in the usages of the Greek and Roman churches." Prayers were also provided for the schools which according to King and Korck, "were of an idolatrous nature, and such as no Protestant, true to the principles of the Gospel, could ever sanction."

But while Korck was having his difficulties with the Greek master of the boy's Lancasterian school on Tenos, the other missionaries failed to report any interference by the Greek government. The annual reports of the Board were evasive on the subject, at least at first. The consensus was that the Protestant clergymen were treated with respect. Books and printing press paper were allowed to enter Greece duty free. In fact the preliminary reports of progress were so satisfactory that the Board considered providing King with an associate; and even authorized him to establish additional schools where they would not interfere with those formed by the government.²⁸

Opposition to the missionaries, however, stiffened during the early 1830s and assumed a more positive and directed character. When Otho ascended the throne of Greece in 1833, the clergy of the liberated kingdom were prepared to formalize their independence from the Patriarchate of Constantinople and pursue a national course. The aim was to strengthen the position and insure the stability of the Greek Church, and place it on the same independent footing that it presumably enjoyed before the Ottoman Conquest.

As a result of a royal decree, a committee was appointed at Nauplia, the temporary seat of the Greek government, to adopt the necessary measures. Then the metropolitans and bishops of the kingdom declared their independence from Constantinople, and the king

was vested with the authority to appoint the synod which constituted "the supreme ecclesiastical authority, in imitation of the Russian model." Another decree of 4 August 1833 officially proclaimed the formation of the National Church of Greece and the establishment of the Greek synod. In doctrinal matters the Greek clergy remained closely identified with the Church in Constantinople, but in temporal affairs the King of Greece was supreme.²⁹

More firmly entrenched than ever, the Orthodox clergy prepared to wage an aggressive campaign against foreign spiritual interlopers. Missionaries who expected to win adherents to the Congregational faith discovered that the Greeks resisted all attempts to proselytize. During the War of Independence they might have accepted the helping hand of anyone promising them freedom, including that of the missionaries, but once independence was gained the Greeks "... brook(ed) no interference with their ideals ... nothing tending to impair national consciousness and unity would be tolerated." The Greek Orthodox Church helped keep the people united during the many years of Ottoman rule, and it proposed to keep them united in peace. "Exclusive, extravagant in its claims, perhaps superstitious in some of its practises, it was nevertheless instrumental in safeguarding the integrity of the nation by preserving the language and folk lore of the people, ... disloyalty to the Orthodox Church was viewed as disloyalty to the nation itself; and a convert to Protestantism became thereby in the eyes of the people a man without a country ..."³⁰

King's evangelical efforts were resisted by the masses who rallied to the support of the ecclesiastical authorities. His work was a direct threat to the nation as well as to the Greek Church itself; King was a subversive; he threatened to impair the newly won unity of the people, his mission was organized and financed by foreigners, and proved an insult to Greek patriotism.

Strong measures were adopted against the circulation of modern Greek translations of the Scriptures. In a proclamation of 1834, the Greek Church authorities stated: "... the new translators desire to put this over against the Septuagint translation which is received as canonical by the Eastern Church, to show by means of the new that the old is mistaken, to weaken or to take away from it wholly its validity, and in this way impart questionings to its readers. If there was need of a new translation of the Old Testament it surely ought to have been made and with the permission and approval of the Eastern Church."³¹

Government curbs followed. One, dealing with the regulation of the press, required that the printer be a Greek citizen, which obviously was intended to check the activities of the foreigners. In

1836 the Greek ruler issued a decree announcing the establishment of a national press which would furnish all the school books needed in the country. In 1837 King faced more than the usual attacks. An inflammatory tract was directed against the Americans, the missionaries and agents from other countries. When the Greek government finally established a gymnasium and a university in Athens, King decided to discontinue his preparatory school and surrender what lingering hopes he might have had about organizing a university. He also encountered trouble in finding teachers because no one was allowed to teach in Greece unless he obtained a diploma from the government. King, however, was gratified to learn that 6 out of the 20 students enrolled in the university in January 1838 were from his seminary.³²

By 1841 the iron hand of the government was felt with greater force. It decreed that a catechism used in the Greek Church had to be used in Board schools, a decree against which King protested, but in vain; he argued that this catechism taught the worship of pictures and other "superstitions" a Protestant could not countenance. Efforts made by him to reverse this order failed, except on condition that the instructions were offered by a suitable person and in a church. Bars likewise were placed on the use of the New Testament and the teaching of religion in the Board schools. The "Great Church" in Constantinople hurled its anathemas against the missionaries, and the Holy Synod in Athens simultaneously worked to curb them. Public attacks also appeared in the press.

These restrictions forced the Board to discontinue its schools, because the regulations of the Greek government ran counter to the dictates of the missionary program. Laments were expressed by King over the abridgment of those religious liberties which the missionaries believed would have enabled them to function. The Board complained that the government interfered with schools supported by benevolent friends in the United States, and not with those subsidized by the Greek people. In 1841 the station in Athens was the only one the Board had in operation. Jonas King was its head.³³

Of interest because of the different strategy and tactics employed was the work of the Protestant Episcopal Board Mission in Greece. In 1829 the Reverend John J. Robertson was commissioned as agent of the "Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society" of the Church to visit Greece and determine the disposition of the people to receive Protestant Episcopal missionaries. Robertson made this spiritual reconnaissance and presented an elaborate report. Robertson was then designated as missionary to Greece, and John J. Hill was assigned

to accompany him as assistant once the latter was admitted to "Holy Orders."⁸⁴

Hill, prior to his spiritual endeavors, graduated from Columbia College and had served as a cashier in a prominent New York bank; but he always maintained an interest in parish work, and served as Superintendent of the Sunday School of St. George's Church. "Moved by the Holy Ghost," he changed from the "mercantile to the ministerial life" and completed his theological studies.

Like the Congregational, the Protestant Episcopal Church sought to find a rational base for sending missionaries to a Christian land such as Greece. Those in Africa, the islands in the Pacific and China were preaching to "non-Christian" or "idolatrous lands," but in Greece the situation was acknowledged as being different. "Greece had its national Christian church . . . a knowledge of the Saviour . . . the Bible, the Ministry, the Sacraments, the Liturgy . . . the whole apparatus of ecclesiastical machinery and equipment, as they had come down to them through the ages, from churches which the Apostles had planted in Corinth and Colosse and Macedonia."

However, the Protestant Episcopal Church believed its actions were consistent with, and supplementary to, those taken by the churches of the civilized nations of Europe and America. While these Christian nations "join hand in hand to reinvest Greece with all that material power which would equip her for self-government and future independence . . .," the Episcopal Church leaders felt they would have been "derelict to the plainest call of God's Providence," had they refused to come to the spiritual support of the Greek Church. The Greek Church "had been despoiled and trodden under foot by Mohammedan power. . . . Errors of doctrine, superstitious usages, lifeless forms, clerical ignorance, ecclesiastical simony, had made the church palsied, helpless, with scarcely any self-regenerating power, with no ability to meet and mould and utilize, the freshest pantings for liberty and light, which were thrilling every nerve in Greece. . . ."

The official position of the Protestant Episcopal Church with respect to the missionaries was made explicit in the instructions Bishop Griswold handed to Messrs. Robertson and Hill when they left Boston for Greece. ". . . you are by no means to say or write or do anything which may justly give rise to the impression that you have visited the Greeks for the purpose of introducing another form of Christianity or establishing another church than that in which they have been nurtured. . . . If . . . the Greek church may appear to you to have departed from the purity and simplicity of primitive times and Spiritual examples, beware how you make them matters of sweeping censure

or direct attack. Strive rather steadily and humbly, in the spirit of the meek and lowly Saviour. . . ."⁸⁵

Athens was selected as the location of the Protestant Episcopal Mission because of its central position, "its facilities of communication, its salubrity, and the fact that it would be the resort of a great many foreigners, through whom their influence and operations might be greatly extended. . . ."

From the outset the Protestant Episcopal efforts were devoted to education and publications. In 1831 a female school was started in the basement of the home shared by the Hills and the Robertsons. After two months, the number of students had increased to 167. "They were of all ages, from three to eighteen. Of the first ninety-six who came in, not more than six could read at all, and that only in a very stammering manner; and not more than ten or twelve knew a letter." On Sunday mornings they gathered "to read, and repeat from memory, passages of the New Testament." Later the students were questioned and supplementary remarks made by the missionaries. A school for boys also was started under the guidance of a Greek priest.

The lack of teachers in Greece persuaded the missionaries "to prepare a portion of their pupils for this important vocation." The school was divided into three departments: one, the "lowest and most numerous," included the beginners "in reading, writing, arithmetic, and a little geography," a second "embraced the study of the Ancient Greek, and an advance in arithmetic, geography, etc.," and the third included "the better scholars, selected from time to time, from the second, and the children of those of high standing, pursuing a limited course of classical reading, etc." The plan was to enlarge upon this work, but since this was also contemplated by another society, the church authorities considered it unwise to incur additional expenses.

Growth of the Hill school forced the mission to acquire larger and better accommodations. A site finally was granted the mission by the municipal authorities in the heart of the city, which once was occupied by a public school. A lot was also purchased for an infant school near the ancient agora; and a two story building was built in which 300 children were instructed daily.⁸⁶

The presence of numerous American and British missionaries in Athens, and the lack of them in other parts of Greece, encouraged Robertson and Hill to transfer the Society press to the Island of Syra, which offered certain commercial and geographical advantages. Once the arrangement was concluded, Robertson and his family transferred their residence to the island.

Meanwhile, the influence of the Hill School in Athens grew steadily and "was officially recognized by the new government, as

a Government Seminary for the instruction of female teachers." Twelve girls, selected from various parts of Greece, were sent to it to be trained as teachers at public expense. In June 1834 some 400 out of the 500 pupils were girls. The school "increased in popularity and numbers constantly, and excited great interest all over the country, and even beyond the borders of Greece." Wealthy Greeks in Constantinople, Moldavia, Asia Minor, and other areas sought admission for their daughters in the school, but in many instances their applications were denied for the want of room. Continued growth made an increase in staff necessary. By March 1839 the Protestant Episcopal "mission family" in Athens consisted of nineteen members.

Besides the large mission school, there was another one in a different part of Athens where a considerable number of girls resided "under a salutary family influence and carried through a more advanced course of instruction." Called the "Troy Institute," this program was suggested and started by the Female Association of Troy, New York, which defrayed a large share of the school's expenses. This school was associated with the Hill residence and comprised "the family department" of the educational program.³⁷ Some of the methods employed by the Hills found their way into the educational system of Greece. Protestant Episcopal sources indicate that, "The [Greek] government copied as far as could safely be done, their modes and principles of teaching, and adopted several textbooks prepared by our Missionaries and issued from the Mission Press. . . ."³⁸

But all was not peace and progress, because opposition to the missionaries mounted in due ratio to their ambitions and the growing strength of the church hierarchy. By late 1846 popular opposition against missionary establishments in Greece and neighboring countries increased noticeably. The Greek Patriarch in Constantinople spearheaded this drive. In his edict he referred to "the Luther-Calvinists" who "have been striving now in these latter times in every way and by every means to infuse the poisonous venom of their heresies in the ears of the Orthodox, to pollute our spotless faith, and to tear in pieces the flock of Christ. That they may accomplish their ends, they announce the diffusion of light; they feign philanthropy; they wander abroad, now as travellers, now as merchants, now as physicians who receive no pay; and now as missionaries and teachers. They expend large sums for antiquities of note; they heal the sick gratuitously; they teach without pay; and all in order to catch the good will of the Orthodox, and contaminate the doctrines received from their fathers. They go to great expense for the printing of books filled with these blasphemies, and now directly and now indirectly, attacking the heavenly doctrines and precepts, traditions and customs of our Holy Orthodox

Church. These they give gratis, or sell at a very low price, under the pretense of doing good, but in reality, that they may do harm, by implanting in the hearts of the Orthodox, and especially of their tender offspring, their lawless blasphemies, . . ." Another section of the edict referred to the missionaries as "Satanic Heresiarchs, who in these last days have reappeared from the caverns of Hell, and the depths of the Northern Ocean." Still another section recommended the establishment of vigilante committees, forbade parents from sending their children to mission schools, and ordered heretical books to be taken from the hands of the Orthodox. The edict was signed by the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and a number of Bishops.³⁹

Eventually, the missionaries became involved in the rivalries of the European powers jockeying for position in Greece. Two vocal factions had emerged: one friendly toward the western powers, and the other toward Russia. The Greek Orthodox Church attitude was greatly influenced by the Russian or Napist group. The latter favored close political and religious cooperation with Russia, and "the entire [Greek] clergy . . . from policy or conviction" constituted strong adherents. The ambition of the Greeks who favored the Napist side was to build "a Greek empire embracing all who profess the Greek creed and speak the Greek language . . ." The community of religious beliefs and the belief that the Czar would be sympathetic to the Greek cause made the Greeks veer in the direction of Russia.

The English and the French comprised a smaller faction that was oriented toward western democratic principles. Numerically inferior to the Russian bloc, this element was headed by men such as Spyridon Tricoupis and Alexander Mavrocordatos. Their position was that of attempting to counteract the opposition instead of exerting a positive influence.⁴⁰

Because Hill was an American, and western European in his orientation, he became the target of attack by the rivals of France and England. In 1842 the *Aeon*, a newspaper, printed a letter Mrs. Hill had written the previous year to an acquaintance which appeared in the New York *Churchman*. This letter sought to soothe Episcopalians who had doubts about the evangelical character of the Hill School. The Greeks who opposed the missionaries immediately seized upon this as proof that the Americans sought to undermine the Greek Orthodox Church. A bitter dispute followed. However, the parents of Hill's pupils rallied to his support and a government investigation exonerated him. The evidence supported Hill's claim that he had always conformed to Greek standards.⁴¹

But at the same time that the Greeks were pacified, opposition developed against Hill among Protestant Episcopal leaders in the

United States who complained over his failure to win converts. Sentiment for discontinuing the mission grew. One church leader "pronounced the Mission at Athens no mission at all, nothing more than a self-supporting female boarding school" and demanded its discontinuance. Efforts to abolish the mission at that time failed. However, when Hill retired in 1869 the school was placed under the direction of one of the teachers.⁴²

Praise of a different character, however, came to the Hill School from another direction. In 1861 President Cornelius C. Felton of Harvard found it a constructive influence and a credit to the Americans. He estimated that the school had an enrollment of 500 or 600 pupils, who in many instances were the children or grandchildren of earlier students. Somewhat indicative of its far-reaching appeal, the school "received the daughters of many of the best families, not only among the Greeks of the Hellenic Kingdom, but among the Greek population of European and Asiatic Turkey." These girls came in search for a higher education; studied the ancient classics, several languages, including the English which they learned to read, write and speak. As a result, the work of the Protestant Episcopal missionaries was felt throughout the Levant.⁴³

Meanwhile, King remained in Greece and the Greeks continued to attack him. He espoused freedom of religion in the western sense which militated against the best interests of the Greeks who considered the preservation of the Orthodox faith as fundamental to the fulfillment of their national aspirations. In 1845 the Patriarch of Constantinople, who had been striving to reestablish ties with the Greek Church in Athens, excommunicated King, who on at least one occasion was compelled to flee the country for his safety.⁴⁴ The relations between King and the Greeks became progressively worse, and the United States State Department, on the complaint of King who was temporarily serving as consul in Athens, decided to launch an investigation.⁴⁵

On April 29, 1852 Daniel Webster, the Secretary of State, ordered George P. Marsh, the United States Minister in Constantinople, to proceed to Athens on board one of the vessels of the Mediterranean squadron. Webster was of the opinion that King was being discriminated against and persecuted by the Greeks because he had learned that the Roman Catholics, the Episcopalians, Lutherans, Jews, and Moslems were at liberty to expound their religious views, while the Congregational missionary was not. Webster reasoned that King, as a citizen of the United States, was entitled to the same protection as "the merchant who seeks for gain, the soldier who fights the battles of other countries, and the sailor who spends his days roving from shore

to shore. . . . The missionary, with untiring benevolence, looks not for his own good, but the good of others. He is, indeed, ambassador, not sent out by the government as their representative, but as the representative of a great number of his fellow-citizens, to communicate knowledge to the ignorant and happiness to the poor. . . ."

It was apparent that King was plagued by problems of a material as well as a spiritual character. In 1830 he had purchased some 70 or 80 thousand square feet of property in Athens. At that time large land purchases were being made by foreigners in Greece, and apparently with the encouragement of the Greek government which sought to attract outside capital and immigrants to develop the resources of the country. King claimed that his property was little prized at the time he purchased it; and that the constitutions under which Greece was governed until 1833, when King Otho ascended the throne, recognized the validity of his land titles. As Athens grew, the value of the property increased; it was "situated on a beautiful elevation, commanding antiquities of Athens, the Piraeus and Gulf of Salamis . . . Mount Par-nassus and the Plain of Athens . . . and Lycammetus and Hymettus. . . ." In 1852 the value of his holdings was quoted at \$25,000.⁴⁶

Marsh was convinced that King had been treated unjustly by the Greek government, especially with respect to his land claims. Regarding the criminal persecution of King, Marsh said: "the legal tribunals of Greece . . . [were] guilty of an abuse of the principles of justice, and a perversion of the rules of law, as flagitious as any that ever disgraced the records of the Star Chamber."⁴⁷

The response of the Greek authorities was that unity and integrity of their nation had to be defended from attack, and that King was subject to the laws of the country as the other residents were. The Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs informed Marsh that the independence of a country such as Greece would be completely destroyed "if every foreigner who thought his interest prejudiced by a judicial act of a legally constituted tribunal in the country of his residence . . . were authorized to protest against such an act before a foreign authority . . . to procure its interposition in the character of a supreme judge over the judicial authority of another independent State." Considering the conditions and the youth of the kingdom, Greece permitted a remarkable degree of religious toleration. ". . . In spite of the gratuitous suppositions of Mr. King . . . the Catholics, the Protestants, the Mohammedan, and the Jew discharge in full liberty their duties to God in their temples, side by side with the Greek Church, without molestation and disturbance." But King was guilty of disrespect toward "the religion of the country which had bestowed its hospitality

upon him. . . ." The Minister of Foreign Affairs considered the turn of affairs most regrettable, and hastened to add that, "His majesty's government has not forgotten, and the nation still remembers with gratitude, the sentiments and noble sympathy and of generous affection which the people of the United States manifested during her glorious struggle for independence. . . ." ⁴⁸

Protestant propaganda made little headway in Greece because the Church was independent and spared from the whims and caprices of an unsympathetic government. It had the support of the masses and could defend itself from interference by civil authorities. It brooked no interference on the part of foreign missionaries, except in encouraging the spiritual regeneration of the people along Greek Orthodox lines. But where the Church lacked this power, as in Constantinople and among the Armenians, Protestant propaganda made headway among the Greeks.

King, whatever his limitations were, had an understanding of the obstacles he faced in Greece. The Greeks wished to remain in touch with their compatriots scattered throughout the Turkish Empire, at least until they regained Constantinople: and they realized that the church was the principal means by which they could do this. Also, they were proud; they could not bear the idea "that strangers should teach them what their fathers taught to others, and received from the apostles themselves." They were suspicious of strangers; furthermore, years of Turkish rule had encouraged them to become "crafty, subtle, ingenious," enabling them to conceal their true sentiments and escape from tyrannies to which they might have been subjected. King reported on many occasions, "The priests and bishops would consider it perfectly justifiable and even a duty . . . to lie." "Under the Mussulman yoke, the Greek was taught from his childhood to regard every iota of his religion as the most sacred; to suffer the greatest tortures and death itself, rather than renounce it; and he considers no disgrace, perhaps, in the eyes of his people so great, as to change his religion."⁴⁹

The lack of progress the mission made in Greece caused the Board to give up in despair. In 1861 it reported: ". . . Twenty-seven ordained missionaries of different denominations have labored more or less in this field. A million copies of books and tracts have been printed by different missionary societies, and scattered over the Greek community. Two hundred thousand copies of the New Testament, and parts of the Old, have been put in circulation in the Modern Greek language. Not a small number of Greek young men have been educated in America and England, by benevolent individuals and societies; and more or less educated in Greece and Turkey at the schools of the various missions. And yet, not ten persons are known, who are confidently believed to

have been truly converted to God by these means! How unlike these results to those we find among the Armenians!"⁵⁰

But all was not in vain. The missionaries might not have harvested the spiritual rewards they sought, but they helped start schools which might or might not have been organized by the Greeks at a much later time. Female, as well as male, education was encouraged, which was in line with what American reformers had been encouraging; and a program of international education, limited as it was in scope, was launched. The Americans lagged behind the French, the English, and the Russians in the influence they exerted; but at least they made a beginning.⁵¹ Finally, the Greek Protestant Church formed in 1870 by pupils of Jonas King, feeble and ineffective as it was, was a product of American missionary effort.⁵²

The difficulties the missionaries faced were legion because they underestimated the effects which a nationalism, unleashed by the War of Independence, had on the people; and the determination they had to cling to their "historic faith." It was foolhardy for the Americans to have expected the Greeks to accept a foreign faith when the problems of political freedom and national unity still weighed heavily on them; and the Church was the one instrumentality that furnished a degree of cohesiveness and direction. The Greeks, to be sure, wanted freedom and representative institutions, but they wanted their kind of freedom and representative institutions. Religious freedom meant one thing to the Greeks and another to the Americans; and the latter discovered that this did not mean freedom to proselytize in the western sense. Seeking converts in a land where church and state worked hand in hand was almost like being committed to the fate of Sisyphus. It was a case of one dogma pitted against another, and it was inevitable that the Greek won out on native soil. The unbelievable presumption of self-righteousness on the part of a man such as King was comparable to that of the Greek clergy. The failure to win over the Greeks was not the result of ignorance and viciousness on their part as it was from the incredible inability of some American missionaries to take seriously the differences in cultural traditions and national goals of the people. Freedom from the Turks encouraged greater and closer subservience to the Greek Orthodox Church, and discouraged deviations from the accepted norm. This was something the most aggressive American religious reformers understood only belatedly.

1. General accounts dealing with missionary and humanitarian activities in Greece at the time of the Greek War of Independence are those of P. E. Shaw, *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches, 1820-1870* (Chicago, 1937);

Edward Meade Earle, "American Interest in the Greek Cause, 1821-1827"; *American Historical Review*, XXVII (October, 1927), pp. 44-63; Myrtle A. Cline, *American Attitude Toward The Greek War of Independence* (Atlanta,

- 1930). See also Joseph Tracy, "History of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions" in *History of American Missions to the Heathen* (Worcester, 1840), pp. 189-190.
2. Convenient accounts of these developments are to be found in John A. Krout and Dixon Ryan Fox, *The Completion of Independence, 1790-1830* (New York, 1944), pp. 150-184, 185-211 and 247-278; Rufus B. Anderson, ed., *Memorial Volume of the First Fifty Years* (Boston, 1861), pp. 41-49; Alice Felt Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment* (Minneapolis, 1944), pp. 29-32.
 3. Shaw, *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches, 1820-1870*, pp. 15-16 and 71.
 4. The most convenient summaries of the activities of the various reformist elements are to be found in Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment*, pp. 197-216, 232-238, 274-279, 319-326, 476-484.
 5. Earle, *American Historical Review*, XXVII, pp. 44-46.
 6. American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, hereafter cited as ABCFM, *Minutes of the Eleventh Annual Meeting* (Boston, 1834), p. 281.
 7. Shaw, *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches*, pp. 15-34, 71-86, 120-133. An account of the Baptist mission is also found in William Gammell, *A History of American Baptist Missions* (Boston, 1849), pp. 299-312.
 8. George Finlay, *History of the Greek Revolution* (Edinburgh and London), I, pp. 174, 186 and 229; Leicester Stanhope, *Greece in 1823 and 1824* (London, 1824), p. 238.
 9. Finlay, *History of the Greek Revolution*, I, pp. 184-185; II, pp. 314-316.
 10. George Perdicaris, *Greece of the Greeks* (New York), II, pp. 288-289.
 11. On the question of pronunciation, see Samuel S. Wilson, *A Narrative of the Greek Mission* (London, 1839), pp. 455-456. See Rufus Anderson, *Observations Upon the Peloponnesus and the Greek Islands* (Boston, 1830), p. 174. Professor Neophytes Vamvas taught the first ABCFM missionaries in modern Greek.
 12. Compare the observations in *Missionary Herald*, XXIV (August, 1828), pp. 244-245 with those in ABCFM, *Minutes of the Eleventh Annual Meeting*, p. 280.
 13. ABCFM, *Fourteenth Annual Meeting*, pp. 124-129. For brief accounts of Fisk and Parsons, see Lucius E. Smith, ed., *Heroes and Martyrs of Modern Missionary Enterprise* (Cincinnati, 1854), pp. 374-384, 385-394.
 14. *Missionary Herald*, XXIII (September, 1827), pp. 267-268 for a copy of the letter Pliny Fisk wrote on the need for establishing a Greek mission.
 15. ABCFM, *Fourteenth Annual Meeting*, pp. 127-129; Tracy in *History of American Missions to the Heathen*, p. 107.
 16. ABCFM, *Fifteenth Annual Meeting*, pp. 110-113. Writing about the educating of youth a number of years later, Anderson wrote: "The experience proved so unsatisfactory in the end that all thought of educating foreign youth in this country, whether from heathen or from Oriental churches, was abandoned; and it became a settled policy of the Board to do all its educational work in the countries where it has its missions." Anderson, *Memorial Volume of the First Fifty Years of the ABCFM*, p. 332. Of the students educated in the United States, in 1828 Nicholas Petrokokino was reported employed in Malta at the printing press; and Anastasius Karavelles was reported teaching in "The Evangelical Gymnasium." Tracy in *History of American Missions to the Heathen*, pp. 179, 213 and 235.
 17. An account of educational facilities in Greece is furnished by Eli Smith in his unpublished manuscript, "Notes On Greece Taken During A Journey In That Country In 1829," which is on deposit in the Houghton Library, Harvard University. See also Rufus B. Anderson, *Observations Upon The Peloponnesus and Greek Islands Made In 1829* (Boston, 1829), pp. 211-224. Regarding Greek schools in Smyrna see extracts from letter by Mr. Gridley, dated March 18, 1827 in *Missionary Herald*, XXIII (September, 1827), pp. 265-267.
 18. *Ibid.*, XXIII (September, 1827), p. 266.
 19. *Ibid.*, XXIII, p. 266; Anderson, *Observations Upon The Peloponnesus and Greek Islands Made In 1829*, pp. 245-246; ABCFM, *Minutes of the Eleventh Annual Meeting*, pp. 280-281. In 1830 Anderson wrote: "There are three separate printing establishments now in the Mediterranean, which are employed, more or less, in furnishing elementary books for liberated Greece. These establishments belong to the Church Missionary Society, the London Missionary Society, and the American Board of Commissioners For Foreign Missions, and are all at present in the Island of Malta. The first is provided with the means of printing in Greek, Italian, Arabic, Amharic, and Ethiopic; the second, in Italian and Greek; and the third, in Italian, Greek, Arabic, Armenian, and Armeno-Turkish, or the Turkish language in the Armenian character. (A fourth establishment, designed to print exclusively in modern Greek, is about to be set up in some part of liberated Greece, by the American Episcopal Missionary Society). . . ." Within a little more than seven years about 180,000 books were

printed in modern Greek. The figures released by the ABCFM press at Malta from the commencement of its operations in July 1822 to December 31, 1829 were as follows:

In Greek	180,650 copies
	7,568,400 pages
In Italian	74,500 copies
	2,253,000 pages
In Armeno-Turkish	21,000 copies
	824,000 pages
	<hr/> 276,150 copies
	<hr/> 10,645,400 pages

Malta ceased to be a station of the Board in 1833. The whole amount of printing done by the press from July 1822 until the closing in 1833 was 350,000 volumes with about 21,000,000 pages. See Tracy in *History of the American Missions to the Heathen*, p. 235.

20. *Missionary Herald*, XXIV (December, 1828), p. 394. On the early activities of Jonas King see *History of the American Missions to the Heathen*, pp. 107, 145-146.
21. Shaw, *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches*, pp. 74-75; *Dictionary of American Biography*, X (New York, 1935), pp. 395-396; F. E. H. Haines, *Jonas King: Missionary to Syria and Greece* (New York, 1879), pp. 202-214.
22. Anderson, *Memorial Volume of the First Fifty Years of the ABCFM*, pp. 189-190.
23. ABCFM, *Twenty-First Annual Meeting*, pp. 48-51; *Missionary Herald*, XXV (August, 1829), pp. 260-261. French influences also were felt in Greece, along with those of the English. French soldiers had helped free the Peloponnesus from Egyptian troops; French scientists helped explore the resources and geography of the country; and Frenchmen were present to exert what aids they could. The Greeks considered French an essential part of their liberal education. French schoolbooks found their way into Greek schools. "The 'Manual of Mutual Instruction,' which the government of Greece has made the exclusive rule of Lancasterian schools, is a French work, by Sarisin; and the Greeks plead the example of the French in suspending a picture of the Saviour in the schools for the adoration of the pupils. . . . Whatever is now done in France to promote free and pure institutions, must exert some influence in Greece." Tracy in *History of American Missions to the Heathen*, p. 190. The plan for a loan was referred by Anderson to the Prudential Committee but "was never executed, as the Board did not feel authorized to loan funds to nations."
24. ABCFM, *Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting*, pp. 72-73.

25. ABCFM, *Twenty-First Annual Meeting*, pp. 50-51. For a copy of the text which promised that "all the subjects of the New State, whatever may be their religion, (culte,) shall be eligible to all public offices, functions, and honors, and treated on the footing of an entire equality, without regard to difference of belief, in all their relations, religious, civil, or political," see 33D Congress, 2d Session, Senate Ex. Doc. No. 67 (Washington, 1854), pp. 78-79.
26. For a copy of this letter see Jonas King, *The Oriental Church and Latin* (New York, 1865), pp. 1-33; *Missionary Herald*, XXIV (August, 1828), pp. 244-245.
27. ABCFM, *Twenty-Second Annual Meeting*, pp. 37-43.
28. ABCFM, *Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting*, pp. 70-73; Tracy in *History of the American Missions to the Heathen*, pp. 203-204. Korck was a German serving as an agent of the English Church Missionary Society.
29. Strong, *Greece As A Kingdom*, pp. 347-365.
30. Shaw, *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches*, pp. 77-78.
31. The resentment against King is well told in *The New Englander*, XVII (January, 1847), pp. 14-20. See also Tracy in *History of the American Missions to the Heathen*, pp. 235 and 249; and Shaw, *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches*, p. 79.
32. ABCFM, *Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting*, pp. 40-41; *Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting*, pp. 46-47; *Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting*, p. 61.
33. ABCFM, *Thirty-Third Annual Meeting*, pp. 100-101.
34. S. D. Denison, *A History of the Foreign Missionary Work of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (New York, 1871), pp. 78-81, 121-128; *Missionary Herald*, XXV (February, 1829), p. 42.
35. *Service Commemorative of the Life and Work of the Reverend John Henry Hill, D.D.* (New York, 1882), pp. 11-16.
36. William Cutter, "Missionary Efforts of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States" in *History of American Missions to the Heathen*, pp. 579-581.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 582-584; George A. Perdicaris, *Greece of the Greeks*, II, pp. 295-296; Strong, *Greece As A Kingdom*, pp. 375-376.
38. *Service Commemorative of the Life and Work of the Reverend John Henry Hill, D.D.*, pp. 19-20.
39. Cutter, "Missionary Efforts of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," *History of American Missions to the Heathen*, p. 585-586.
40. Henry M. Baird, *Modern Greece* (New York, 1856), pp. 111-112. On French, German, and Russian influences in

- Greece, see *New Englander*, XVII, pp. 13-14 and Perdicaris, *Greece of the Greeks*, II, pp. 294-295.
41. Shaw, *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches*, pp. 29-30.
 42. *Service Commemorative of the Life and Work of the Reverend John Henry Hill, DD., LL.D.*, p. 20; Shaw, *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches*, pp. 31-32.
 43. Cornelius C. Felton, "The Schools of Modern Greece," *North American Review*, XCVII (July, 1861), pp. 278-279; W. L. Wright, Jr., "John Henry Hill," *Dictionary of American Biography*, IX (New York, 1935), pp. 41-42.
 44. ABCFM, *Thirty-Seventh Annual Meeting*, pp. 92-94; *Thirty-Eighth Annual Meeting*, p. 89; *Thirty-Ninth Annual Meeting*, pp. 135-141.
 45. Baird, *Modern Greece*, pp. 363-365.
 46. *33D Congress, 2d Session, Senate, Ex. Doc. No. 9* (Washington, 1854), pp. 2-5.
 47. *33D Congress, 2d Session, Senate, Ex. Doc. No. 67* (Washington, 1854), pp. 12-13.
 48. *Ibid.*, *Ex. Doc. No. 67*, pp. 174-177.
 49. ABCFM, *Thirty-Fifth Annual Meeting*, pp. 90-97.
 50. Anderson, *Memorial Volume of the First Fifty Years of the ABCFM*, pp. 356-357.
 51. Perdicaris, *Greece of the Greeks*, II, p. 293.
 52. Shaw, *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches*, pp. 135-156; ABCFM, *Fifty-Eighth Annual Meeting*, pp. 13-14.

DOCTORAL THESES

"William Farel, Reformer of the Swiss Romand, His Life, His Writings and His Theology" by Donald H. MacVicar. (Arlington Avenue Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.) Union Theological Seminary, New York City, 1954. Director: Professor Wilhelm Pauck.

William Farel, the lifelong and most intimate friend of John Calvin, and the Reformer of French-speaking Switzerland, has received little attention from British and American scholars. His leadership in bringing about the triumph of the Reformation in Geneva, his work there in partnership with Calvin from 1536 to 1538, as well as a few incidents in which the two men were involved in later years are well-known. But these things were only a part of Farel's long and interesting career.

This dissertation is a study of Farel's life, his writings and his theology. It seeks to do justice to a man, hitherto neglected. That he was the close friend of two such different men as Jacques Lefèvre and John Calvin surely indicates that Farel had fine and enduring qualities of character. The relationship of Farel to Calvin was like that between an older and a younger brother. Farel's influence over Calvin was considerable and not easily to be explained. It is, indeed, a debatable point whether Calvin could ever have accomplished what he did without Farel.

Farel was a Reformer in his own right. It was the inspiration and theology of Lefèvre which pointed him toward the Protestant faith, but it was the strength of his own convictions which led him to be the first Frenchman to see that the Reformation must be accomplished outside the Roman Catholic Church. These points are studied in the first part of the dissertation.

Farel's first hope was to work for the evangelical cause in France, but

the opposition to him there brought him to Switzerland. He proved to be a pioneer missionary of the first rank, and most of French-speaking Switzerland entered the Reformed fold through his efforts. In his long ministry in Neuchâtel, his ability as pastor and organizer was tested in many ways, but that did not prevent his having a keen interest in the union of all the Protestant forces in Switzerland and in Europe. The central part of this dissertation is a study of these matters.

Farel's writings were produced to meet the needs of his work. His *Sommaire* (1525) and *La Manière et Façon* (1533) are the best known, but he wrote many other books and pamphlets. These, along with his correspondence, give many interesting details of his life and work, and of the beginnings of the evangelical church in France and Switzerland.

Farel's theology is that of the early evangelicals of France. The *Sommaire* was written before Farel had come into touch with Calvin, but there is not a great deal of change in the editions following his acquaintance with Calvin's views. The last third of the dissertation is a study of Farel's writings, and of his theology.

The primary sources used include Lefèvre's commentaries *S. Pauli Epistolae* and *Commentarii in iudicium in quattuor evangelia*; the nine volumes of Herminjard's *Correspondance des Reformateurs*; many letters and articles in the *Calvini Opera*; as well as nearly all of Farel's surviving works. The secondary sources are too numerous to give here, but special mention should be made of *Guillaume Farel, Une Biographie Nouvelle* by "Le Comité Farel," Neuchâtel and Paris, 1930.

"The Americanization of the Augustana Lutheran Church," by Pastor Gene Jessie Lund, Th.D. (Elbow Lake, Minnesota). Princeton

Theological Seminary, 1954. Director: Dr. Lefferts A. Loetscher.

When the Augustana Synod (now the Augustana Lutheran Church) was organized in 1860 it was a typical immigrant communion. The synod was founded by Swedish pioneers who spoke Swedish and thought in Swedish, and who still possessed a great love for their fatherland. After two generations, however, the Augustana Synod was as thoroughly Americanized as any other Lutheran group in the country (excepting, perhaps, the United Lutheran Church). What caused this transition to take place, and to take place as rapidly as it did?

The Swedish background has much preparatory significance. The Swedish state church of the nineteenth century, autocratic and oppressive in many ways, conditioned the Augustana pioneers to welcome America's free-church system. The conservative episcopal form of polity (still used in Sweden) was eschewed in favor of a modified congregationalism. Then too, the Swedes are a cosmopolitan people, and the great majority of those who came to America felt at home here. They came to settle permanently, and to become American citizens. The Swedish immigrants did not settle in hermetic colonies, as did many other foreign groups; they mingled freely with the native stock. As a result, they soon learned the English language, and other American ways.

The American environment was a powerful conditioning factor. The Swedes were made to feel welcome in the New World. The public schools probably did more than any other agency to mold the Augustana pioneers into the American image. Inter-marriage helped to hasten the process of assimilation for many Swedes. The older American churches provided a pattern for ecclesiastical adaptation, and also a great deal of competition (which often prompted the Augustana congregations to do as their competitors did; e.g., conduct revival meetings).

In spite of these favorable conditions, however, the synod at the turn

of the century remained distinctly Swedish. Many of the second-generation leaders were staunch Swedes who fought to preserve the status quo. But to no avail. With the coming of the second decade of this century it became clear that the tide was running too strong to be stemmed. The climax of the struggle was reached with the entry of the U. S. A. into the first World War. In that hyper-patriotic period, the Americanization of all things foreign became the object of feverish policy. The use of foreign languages was discouraged and even banned (e.g., in Iowa). Augustana congregations were greatly influenced. With the signing of the Armistice the zeal of the chauvinists cooled, but the Augustana Synod was never the same again.

The post-war era witnessed the maturation of a new emphasis. Augustana's "Swedishness" disappeared almost altogether. To be sure, certain aspects of its Old World heritage have not been spurned (e.g., its conservative Lutheran theology). Today, the immigrant Augustana Synod is the indigenous, Americanized, Augustana Lutheran Church.

"History of the Freewill Baptists: a study in New England Separatism." Norman A. Baxter (Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids, Pa.). Harvard, 1954. Director, Professor George H. Williams.

This is a study of a movement in New England which had its original impetus in the Great Awakening and was one factor in the fragmentation of the religious scene there. The purpose was two-fold: first, to utilize the previously overlooked literary corpus and so delineate their history, and second, to relate their development to a denominational morphology as reflected in the activities of their contemporaries.

Benjamin Randall, a Portsmouth sailmaker, was converted through the ministry of Whitefield. Shortly thereafter he began to preach, and in 1780 he settled in New Durham, N. H. It was there that Randall took exception to the prevailing Calvinist doctrine of

election and, with the help of a few partisans, proclaimed the free will gospel throughout northern New England.

The formative period ended with Randall's death in 1808, and beginning in the 1820's, the Randallites, as they were called, took on a denominational form. They founded the *Morning Star* in 1825, which was published weekly for eighty-six years; they organized academies for the training of ministers and they took an active part in preaching on the frontier. They opened the mission field in Bengal, now an integral part of the American Baptist Convention's Bengal-Orissa station. Educationally, they founded Hillsdale, Bates, Keuka and Storer colleges.

One of the aspects of the study was tracing the decline of Calvinism among Baptists in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Once this metamorphosis had seeped into Baptist thinking, the Freewill Baptist message lost its unique appeal. This, together with the failure of this predominantly rural people to move into the urban areas as quickly as other denominations, resulted in startling numerical losses after 1870. This led to sentiments favorable to reunion with the Baptists, which came in 1911. In so doing, the Freewill Baptists pointed the way for the several denominational mergers since then, and form a salient contrast to the splintering so common among Baptists.

The manuscript sources for the early years were located at the New Hampshire Historical Society in Concord, N. H., while most of the printed materials are available at Bates College library, and at the American Baptist Historical Society, Crozer Seminary, Chester, Pa.

"Free Churches and Social Change, A Critical Study of the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches of the United States." By Cyrus Ransom Pangborn (Douglass College, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey). Columbia University, 1951. Faculty Director: Dr. John C. Bennett.

The Congregational Christian Council for Social Action, when established in 1934, was the first such agency created by any denomination to have official status and a position comparable to a major missions board. Its founders wished it to bear witness to the Calvinist-Puritan ideal of holiness in the common life without incorporating the authoritarian and uniformitarian defects of earlier experiments. The dissertation begins by outlining the social evolution of American Congregationalism from 1620 through the nineteenth century. It then proceeds to make a critical study of the Council for Social Action as the culmination of this process of development. The divisions of this part of the study are the Council's work, organizational development, relationship to the denomination, friends and enemies, major assumptions in theology, ethics, and social theory. Its social views are found to bear such similarity to pronouncements of other denominations' agencies and ecumenical bodies that, taken together, they express a normative liberalism which opposes the nominalism of nineteenth century individualism by subscribing to a view of society as an organism in which persons, corporate bodies, and institutions all alike have their own identifiable reality, vitality, and history.

The conclusion is that the Council for Social Action is but the beginning of what must be a vastly greater effort, unless the churches wish to place themselves outside the arena wherein social forces are contending for influence.

"The Theologies of the American Social Gospel," by Harold A. Durfee. (Park College, Parkville, Missouri). Union Theological Seminary, 1951. Faculty Directors: Reinhold Niebuhr and John Bennett. (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1951).

The thesis attempts to indicate the unity and diversity of theological positions within the American Social Gospel. The Social Gospel is understood as the reaction of a group of Ameri-

can evangelical Protestants to the problems presented by the industrial revolution.

The dissertation considers movements in the background of the Social Gospel such as Sectarianism, Calvinism, the Enlightenment, and English Christian Socialism. It then analyzes the theology of Americans who anticipated the Social Gospel writers. These include Horace Bushnell, Theodore Munger, Samuel Harris, Elisha Mulford, and John Bascom.

There is then an analysis of the doctrines of God, Man, the Christ, and the Kingdom of God as these doctrines were understood by leading representatives of the Social Gospel. In the early period special attention is given to the thought of Washington Gladden. Chief among the others considered are Lyman Abbott, Josiah Strong, George Herron, William D. P. Bliss. In the middle period special attention is given to the theology of Walter Rauschenbusch. The others considered as representative of the middle period are Harry C. King, Shailer Mathews, Henry C. Vedder, George Harris, Charles D. Williams, V. Scudder, and J. H. W. Stuckenberg. The representatives of the late period are F. J. McConnell, C. A. Ellwood, E. F. Tittle, C. C. Morrison, Harry F. Ward, and Kirby Page.

The writers emphasized the immanence of Deity, which furnished ground for the interpretation of all other doctrines. Such a doctrine was in danger of semi-panteistic interpretations, and during the late period tension between the immanence and transcendence of Deity appeared quite clearly.

In the analysis both of man's sin and of his salvation special attention was given to the social nature of these realities. Man's sin was thus usually understood as rebellion against God, due to man's corrupt institutions or to the lack of development in man's higher spiritual capacities thus far in the evolutionary process. There was constant confusion concerning the relationship of man's freedom to this evolutionary development.

The doctrine of the Christ emphasized the humanity of Jesus and His

essential unity with mankind. There was an emphasis upon Jesus' teachings and His ethical character, including His God-consciousness. It is usually through these factors that Jesus offers man salvation. There was also an emphasis upon the doctrine of the Kingdom of God, which was understood as the divine society which is being created. There was a tendency to expect its coming within history, although there is some indication of non-historical eschatological tendencies in the movement.

The movement is viewed as a strong expression of Idealistic philosophy, although an anti-metaphysical tendency appears in many places. As a part of this idealism the Social Gospel theologians were committed to interpreting process in theistic terms. Thus the movement appears as one of the first attempts in American Protestantism to face the problems of the philosophy of process and change (characteristic especially of Pragmatism and Neo-Realism) and to give an idealistic version of evolution and history.

"Social Policy of the Episcopal Church in the Twentieth Century," by M. Moran Weston (281 Fourth Avenue, New York 10) Columbia Univ., 1954. Directors: Horace L. Friess and Robert T. Handy.

This study is a critical historical account of the national social policy of the American Episcopal Church since 1900. It traces the development of such policy in actions of that Church's General Convention and other national bodies, such as the House of Bishops, and the National Council. It relates this policy to the general social situation out of which it emerged and seeks to assess its effectiveness.

The material, which is drawn chiefly from official documents and the files of unofficial Episcopal periodicals, is presented under eight broad headings: the social task of the Church, described as an "endless debate"; social service to individuals and special groups; economic issues and relations; participation of disadvantaged social groups in the Church's life; the nature

of the social order; Church and State relations; the quest for world order and peace; and the Church's efforts to implement its policy. There is a brief summary at the end of each chapter and the author's findings are presented in a concluding chapter.

The need to improve industrial relations was the first national issue to receive official attention and continuous effort, when the 1901 Convention set up a study commission on this issue. For more than a decade thereafter the Church sought to arrive at a common mind on the difficult economic issues of the expanding urban-industrial civilization. Although its policymakers were chiefly business and professional men, and clergy, it sought a non-partisan role.

Problems resulting from duplication in the life of the Church of social disadvantages existing in secular society, based on sex, color or nationality, have been among the most perplexing and unsolved in the Church's own life. In particular, women church members have faced a male monopoly of church power; Afro-Americans and others have faced both a racial monopoly and segregation.

After World War I, the Church gave increasing attention to the nature of the social order and came to recognize the need for far-reaching social and economic reforms. It rejected and has opposed the fascist and communist totalitarian social orders.

The Church views the State as the supreme authority in civil affairs, but holds that it is subject to moral law, of which the Church is custodian. Thus, separation of Church and State does not mean isolation but a dynamic balance of mutual responsibility.

The Church is world-minded and peace-minded but not pacifist. It has consistently promoted peace education and has supported a variety of "alternatives to war," including the World Court, the League of Nations, and the United Nations.

While a broad range of issues has been considered, Episcopal social policy has never reached its potential effectiveness for two principal reasons:

(1) Prior to 1920, there was no na-

tional machinery for coordinating and prosecuting church policy. Since then, there has been a basic structure for this purpose, but adequate authority, funds, and staff for an effective church-wide program have not been provided. (2) While the national leadership has consistently accepted a broad view of the social task of the Church, this has not always been true on the parochial level.

"The Concept of Being in the Thought of Jonathan Edwards," by Thomas Anton Schafer. (Divinity School, Duke University, Durham, N. C.) Duke University, 1951. Director: H. Shelton Smith.

The problem of the thesis was to discover the precise character of Edwards' ontology and the degree to which his conceptions of being furnish a synthetic core for his religious and philosophical thought. Part One of the thesis provides biographical and philosophical background. Part Two delineates the "structure" of being in Edwards' metaphysics, including his doctrine of "excellency." Chapters on God, the world, and man exhibit Edwards' metaphysical concepts in various parts of his system as they condition and are conditioned by his thinking on such subjects as the Trinity, the nature of matter, the meaning of causality, the freedom of the will, and the depravity of man. In Part Three, two central themes in Edwards' thought are examined: the creative outflow of the divine glory (the "end in creation") and its reflection or remanation in intelligent beings (especially the "true virtue" of the saints).

Among the conclusions reached were the following. Edwards got his chief philosophical ideas from the Augustinianism and Neoplatonism of the English Puritans, the metaphysics of Locke and Newton, and the ideas of Cartesians like Malebranche. Edwards' "empiricism" is, however, not basically Lockean; it is really Augustinian illuminism. And his idealism is not, at bottom, mentalism or phenomenism (though there are traces of

both); it is more nearly an objective idealism. His concept of being performs a remarkable work of synthesis in his theology; all his doctrines are organized (to some extent unconsciously) around the notion of the outflow and return of being along the hierarchical chain of existences. The five points of Calvinism are reasserted within a framework of cosmic optimism, sufficient reason, universal harmony, and natural fitness.

Besides the tensions created by Calvinistic voluntarism in contact with the Enlightenment concepts of causality and natural law, there are also con-

flicts within the central metaphysical tradition itself (e.g., the relation between being *qua* being and the being of God). Significantly, the mediating concepts which Edwards develops (e. g., his definitions of law and causality) also require for their success the hierarchical structure of the chain of being. If Edwards is allowed his fair share of inconsistency as he grapples with ultimate mysteries, he emerges as *the* philosophical theologian of Calvinism, worthy of study today not only for his historical importance but also for the richness and suggestiveness of his religious thought.

BOOK REVIEWS

Barton Warren Stone: Early American Advocate of Christian Unity. By WILLIAM GARRETT WEST. Nashville: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1954. xvi + 245 pages. \$4.00.

Barton W. Stone (1772-1844) was one of the Big Four whom the Disciples of Christ revere as the founding fathers of their communion. The other three were Thomas and Alexander Campbell (father and son) and Walter Scott. These came to America in manhood from Ireland and Scotland and began their reformatory work soon after, having had time to feel the impact of American sectarianism but not much opportunity to learn a great deal about the currents of American religious thought or the streams of its vigorous religious life. Stone, by contrast was an "old American" even in the 18th century. His great-great-grandfather was William Stone, the first Protestant governor of Maryland. Barton Stone was born in Maryland, nurtured in Virginia, educated in North Carolina, got his first job (teaching) in Georgia, saw the raw frontier in Tennessee, and did his life's work in Kentucky. From the time of his enrollment as a youth in David Caldwell's famous school at Guilford, N. C., he was in contact with persons and movements which made him aware not only of the rigidities of a Calvinistic orthodoxy that repelled him but also of strains of more liberal thought in the light of which many doctrinal differences seemed insignificant and sectarian rivalries irrelevant.

By the play of his own initiative, stimulated and fed by these influences, Stone became an ardent advocate of Christian unity. This is the phase of his life and thought to which Dr. West gives most attention in this excellent work, which was developed out of his Yale Ph.D. thesis. It is clearly no exaggeration to say that Stone was an "early American advocate of Chris-

tian unity." He was certainly early, for any spokesman for that cause before 1844, the year of his death, can be called "early." He was American to the core. He was by temperament a vigorous advocate of anything he believed in with his whole heart. And what he wholeheartedly believed in was not merely frontier friendliness and practical cooperation among denominations but a complete unity of Christians in which denominations would disappear.

Among the influences which played upon Stone in his young manhood and drew him in this direction were these, as Dr. West shows: the lingering force of the Great Awakening with its urge for conversion and the salvation of souls; the initial crescendo of Methodism, stressing the love of God for all men rather than his implacable wrath toward sinners; "new-light" Presbyterianism, strongly evangelistic, tolerant toward a very loose construction of the Westminster Confession, not greatly interested in predestination and least of all in the "double decree," confident that "Christ died for all men"; individual "new-lights" like Henry Patillo, William Hodge and John Springer; the O'Kelly secession from Methodism (actually, from Asburyism), leading to the "Christian Church" in North Carolina and adjacent states. The Great Western Revival, centering in Kentucky, temporarily fused together some of these sect-transcending tendencies in the emotional fires of its evangelistic zeal. Its climax came at the spectacular Cane Ridge meeting (1801) which occurred in, at and around a Presbyterian church of which Stone was pastor, a few miles east of Paris, Ky.

The whole series of big revival meetings, of which Cane Ridge was the biggest, established a plane of cleavage between those Presbyterian preachers who were "revival men" and those who

were not. The revival men were regarded by the others as too Methodistic to be good Presbyterians. Some were accused of "preaching Arminianism." Two were cited before the synod; these and three others (including Stone) withdrew from the synod's jurisdiction and called themselves an independent presbytery (1803); the five and one other who had joined them dissolved their Springfield Presbytery (1804) that they might "sink into union with the Body of Christ at large" and voted to call themselves simply "Christians," as O'Kelly's "Republican Methodists" had done ten years before.

Late in his life, Stone wrote that "Christian unity had been the dominant passion" of his life. It certainly became that, but the documentary evidence does not show that it became so very early in his life. At age 32 he was one of six who signed (though he did not write) the "Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery," the only sentence of which that refers to Christian unity is the one quoted above. The rest of the document defends the autonomy of the local congregation and the restoration of certain primitive practices. At age 42, Stone wrote his earliest recorded words about unity—three pages, and very strong ones, in a 100-page "Address to the Christian Churches" in which 50 pages are devoted to refutation of the doctrine of vicarious atonement. At 56 (in 1826) he began to edit and publish the monthly *Christian Messenger*, in which advocacy of Christian union is constant and emphatic.

Stone has been somewhat neglected by Disciple historians in the past. To compensate, there has arisen what might be called a "Kentucky school" which is committed to exalting him to a status of "priority" in everything. The documentary evidence, as displayed in detail by Dr. West, does not support this idea. Controversy on the subject is unprofitable, and he engages in none but in the main presents the facts, with interpretations properly appreciative of the work and spirit of this pioneer unionist. Stone seems nev-

er to have given much thought to defining the nature of the Church, but he believed that all Christians ought to live together as brothers with no sectarian walls between them, and that if they would put aside their creeds as tests of fellowship, be tolerant of one another's theological opinions, be humble and gentle and more willing to learn than to teach, and love one another, unity would take care of itself.

W. E. GARRISON

University of Houston

The Development of Negro Religion.

By RUBY F. JOHNSTON. New York; The Philosophical Library, 1954. xxi and 202 pages.

This volume contains some useful information and interesting observations about what is currently happening in the Negro Church. It is, however, poorly written and unconvincing. The title applies only to the first third of the book. The remaining pages deal with a small segment of Negro Protestantism. The volume suffers from too great a diversity of material. The reader is often unsure as to whether observations about current Negro Christianity are based on general second hand knowledge or the specific survey. Likewise the author freely mixes historical or sociological description with impassioned exhortation. She explains in her preface that she is writing for popular consumption and not for the scholar seeking elaborate proof. Any level of reader, however, will be handicapped by the clumsy language which appears in places (e.g. "compensatingly enjoyable," p. ix; "decrecent supernatural value-attitudes," p. 79). Repetition of ideas and phrases is frequent enough to be annoying, and the reader's curiosity as to who the author is is left unsatisfied as a result of no word in the volume identifying her.

The first part of the book is a helpful brief summary of the development of Christianity among Negroes during the period of slavery and after the Emancipation. The emotionalism in 18th and 19th Century Negro worship is seen as stemming from appalling suffering and dreariness of life, from

which some release was found in corporate outpouring of feelings about present troubles and future hopes. Prevalent opposition by slave-owners to instruction of slaves in the elements of the Christian faith also kept to a minimum the rational content of sermons in the early days of slavery in this country. The author notes that religion is playing a diminishing role in 20th Century American life. Physical values and pleasures seem to exercise more influence on men's thoughts and habits than formerly. The church has ceased to regulate men's behavior and has become a competitor with many other social organizations in seeking to attract and keep men's interest. Along with this, there has been a decline in belief in God, the after-life and the efficacy of prayer. For Negroes the decline in the influence of the Church has occurred more slowly than for the rest of Americans, because Negroes have had less and poorer education and in other ways have been limited in their participation in the main trends of American life. Moreover, the Negro Church has, for obvious reasons, been more concerned with progress toward racial justice than have churches made up of whites.

The great bulk of this book is an analysis of the current beliefs of church members and types of worship services in a few Negro churches in Boston and in Orangeburg County, South Carolina. 204 church members were interviewed and 40 ministers. The author finds that the results of these interrogations substantiate the fact that church members' belief in God is declining in fervor and their desire for sermons and church activities to be related to practical community problems is increasing. She finds that the growing distaste for overt emotional expression in worship leads to serenity in worship and substantial rational-ethical content in some cases. In others colorless and cold services seem deeply deficient though "respectable." This attitude survey is of limited worth to any critical reader for a number of reasons other than the unreadability referred to above. We are given no reason why these particular rural and

urban churches have been chosen as representative of the American Negro Church. One is not sure of the accuracy of the tabulations. For instance, those who answered the question, "Do you believe there is a God . . . ?" with "Yes" are classified as having a moderate belief; those who answered "I do" or "I surely do" are described as having a warm belief; and those who said, "I know there is a God" are described as having enthusiastic belief. The author loosely generalizes from these data in discovering "trends" in religious faith and practices among Negroes. Yet no data have been gathered from an earlier period with which this very limited church member response can be compared.

DAVID E. SWIFT

American Friends Service Committee

Alexandrian Christianity; Selected Translations of Clement and Origen with Introductions and Notes. By JOHN ERNEST LEONARD OULTON AND HENRY CHADWICK. Library of Christian Classics, vol. II. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954. pp. 475. \$5.00.

When this particular volume of The Library of Christian Classics was planned, there were no English translations of Clement's "On Marriage" (*Stromateis*, III) or Origen's *On Prayer*, the *Exhortation to Martyrdom* nor his *Dialogue with Heraclides*—a newly discovered and still scarcely known writing. It is, therefore, something of an embarrassment that two excellent English editions of the *On Prayer* have appeared between the planning and the publishing of Chadwick and Oulton's volume. John O'Meara has done both *On Prayer* and *The Exhortation to Martyrdom* (in the Ancient Christian Writers, Vol. XIX) and Eric George Jay has published a complete introduction and a good translation of *The Treatise on Prayer* (S.P.C.A., 1954). Thus, the futile wisdom of hindsight suggests that Chadwick and Oulton could have served us better if they had omitted these two relatively minor treatises of Origen, and had given us the Com-

mentary on John, a competent translation of which is very badly needed!

Even so, this volume is bound to prove a useful resource for patristic studies. The translations are faithful and clear and the introductions are uncommonly full and informative. By all odds the most exciting item in the volume is *The Dialogue with Heraclides*. This comes from a manuscript discovery made in 1941, and has now for the first time been put into English—a hitherto unknown work! It is a record of a doctrinal discussion between Origen and a certain bishop, Heraclides, about whom nothing else is known except that his orthodoxy had been called into question, and Origen had been brought in as a sort of theological referee. The little treatise is a fascinating window into Origen's mind on such controversial questions as the relation of the Son to the Father and the fate of the human soul at death. Thus it affords an important check upon the conflicting interpretations of Origen as between Jerome and Rufinus. Chadwick's introduction to the treatise is excellent.

This book will require extensive supplementation by anyone seeking to comprehend the Alexandrine theology as a whole. As such, therefore, it is something of a misnomer. But it is a book which no one pretending to study Alexandrine theology can afford to ignore or to miss.

ALBERT C. OUTLER

Perkins School of Theology
Southern Methodist University

Medieval Political Ideas by EWART LEWIS. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1954. Two vols., 661 pp., \$12.50.

Writing of the contribution of the Middle Ages to the present day, Professor Ernest Barker says "That contribution is very real, and very profound. The Middle Ages are the pit from which we were digged, and the rock from which we were hewn." Not until the nineteenth century had passed the halfway mark did scholars turn their attention to those centuries preceding the fifteenth century during

which our present-day western civilization was in formation. German scholars were particularly outstanding in this research, foremost among them being Otto von Gierke. Many years later English scholars such as the Carlyles and John Neville Figgis took up the work. Noteworthy in this country have been the contributions of James Westfall Thompson and Charles McIlwain.

Through the efforts of these people and others, the Dark Ages appear no longer a period of stagnation but rather one of intense activity and growth. In no fields have results of patient research in the Middle Ages brought forth more significant material than in the fields of law and political theory. Modern constitutionalism, the origins of representative institutions, theories of limited executive authority, the complex relations of the individual to the law, and the recognition of standards outside the political by which the political is judged—these and many other contributions of the Middle Ages help us not only to understand but to appreciate the deep roots which responsible government has in western thought. All of this constitutes a rich heritage. Above all it illuminates the humane effects of Christian teachings on classical thought. Miss Ewart Lewis now joins that noble company of scholars who have penetrated the depths of medieval political theory. She not only gives us intelligently selected groups of readings from original sources but prefaces each group with a commentary that shows understanding and appreciation of this fascinating period of western political thought. Not only will students of the period find these two volumes of great value, but they may also be read with profit by clergymen and seminarians for the excellent analysis of the ever-recurring problems of the relationship of *regnum* and *sacerdotium* which arise in every age and will continue to arise so long as Christianity is a dynamic faith.

Specialists in the study of Marsilius of Padua may question Miss Lewis's defending him from the charge of an outright legal voluntarism, akin to

democratic totalitarianism. She makes a plausible case. It seems, too, that she makes the difference in the theory of Boniface VIII and Gregory VII much sharper than it was. A different set of circumstances confronted each. Each asserted vigorously a power over temporals *casualiter*, and each would have denied a departure from the theory of Gelasius I. Boniface, however, confronted a new factor in church-state relations, the forces of nationalism and the nation state. In the eleventh century Gregory confronted not a powerful nation state but an empire that was at best a shadow of its Roman predecessor. However powerful the Emperor Henry VI may have been in Gregory's time, Philip the Fair of France in Boniface's time was not only more conscious of his power but a far more dangerous antagonist. The theories of Gregory and Boniface, with some change in emphasis, were substantially the same, but their opponents were quite different in their ability to assert their claims.

JEROME G. KERWIN

University of Chicago

John Wesley, Band I (Die Zeit vom 17. Juni 1703 bis 24. Mai 1738). By MARTIN SCHMIDT. Zurich and Frankfurt a.M.: Gotthelf-Verlag. 1953. pp. 334.

Historical research dealing with John Wesley's life and thought has, understandably, received scant attention from German scholarship. Now, Dr. Martin Luther Schmidt, Professor of Church History in the Kirchlichen Hochschule of Berlin makes available volume one of his projected two volume study of the life of John Wesley. It is the first biography in German to follow the canons of scientific historiography and may well set an enviable criterion for the study of Wesley in any language. The author has devoted considerable attention to Wesleyana since the publication of his doctoral dissertation, *Die Bedeutung Luthers für John Wesleys Bekehrung*, (Bremen, 1938). He has also published a number of articles in German journals

treating various aspects of Wesley's life.

The special significance of this work lies in the thorough investigation and evaluation of the influence of German Pietism on the young John Wesley. Professor Schmidt bases his judgments on a vast amount of source material, much of it in German, which has been only slightly used, if at all, by other biographers of Wesley. Three well-known investigations of this issue are: A. W. Nagler, *Pietism and Methodism*, (Nashville, 1918), P. Bohmer, *Pietismus und Methodismus*, (Berlin, 1895), and P. Scott, *John Wesleys Lehre von der Heiligung, Verglichen mit einem Lutherisch-pietistischen Beispiel*, (Berman, 1939). Dr. Schmidt points out, however, that the problem of the demonstrable Pietistic influences on Wesley, as manifested in these previous studies, is only part of the complex of factors which need to be taken into account. Of even greater importance is the query: In what ways did the specific Pietistic sources studied by Wesley determinatively pattern his comprehension of Luther? Indeed, a further issue must be faced, especially by a Lutheran historian, *viz.*, the problem raised in Ritschl's monumental history of Pietism concerning the validity of the Pietistic interpretation of Luther. Professor Schmidt maintains that Wesley's appreciation of Luther, as brought to his awareness through the Salzburger, the Moravians, and especially the famous little book Wesley studied so assiduously, *Pietas Halensis*, was not a distortion of Luther's evangelicalism, although at many points Wesley's failure to comprehend the full sweep of Luther's theological perspective may be attributed to these somewhat prejudicial sources.

On the other hand, the author gives a discerning analysis of the relationship between Wesley and his youthful mentor, William Law; which turns out to be an illuminating discussion of Law's misunderstanding of German mysticism and its relevance for Pietism.

At the level of factual biographical data, Professor Schmidt has demonstrated typical Teutonic thoroughness. The references indicate that every

relevant source has been investigated. The account of Wesley's conversion experience is masterful chiefly because the author is not tempted to see it in purely psychological terms. In this chapter we may have the definitive answer to Piette, Leger, and others who, with impressive scholarship, have argued for the relative insignificance of this experience.

In this work a German Lutheran scholar returns the compliment extended through the comprehensive interpretation of Luther studies for the English speaking world by the British Methodists, Philip Watson and Gordon Rupp.

DAVID C. SHIPLEY

Garrett Biblical Institute
Evanston, Illinois

The Tinkling Spring Headwater of Freedom, A Study of the Church and Her People, 1732-1952, by HOWARD McKNIGHT WILSON. Fishersville, Virginia: The Tinkling Spring and Hermitage Presbyterian Churches, 1954; pp. xviii + 542.

Here is a "local" history—of the Tinkling Spring Presbyterian Church in Virginia's Shenandoah Valley—which by use of closely documented and diverse primary sources relates its story to the larger life of its times and presents a picture of dissenting Christianity in Virginia which has real interest and a degree of representative significance.

From the original squatters in the 1730's, struggling to attain legal title, a community gradually emerged near where Staunton now is. When Governor Gooch promised to tolerate this Presbyterian congregation beyond the mountains, more Scotch-Irish came down from Pennsylvania. The primitive economic and domestic life of the frontier is portrayed. Indians were a menace, particularly after Braddock's defeat in western Pennsylvania. Sunday worship was practically an all-day undertaking, from ten until noon and from one o'clock until sunset, with pastor in periwig and with the clerk "lining out" the psalms for singing. It was not until the early nineteenth cen-

tury that hymns were sung, and not to organ accompaniment for another half century. The Great Awakening comes into the story, with the pastor an "Old Side" opponent of the revival. Revivalism continued in the nineteenth century to be an important factor, with presbytery warning its churches against "extraordinary bodily exercises."

Nearly half of the book concerns the pre-Revolutionary period centering around the first pastor, John Craig, whose brief autobiography is used to advantage. The private papers of another pastor, Robert L. Dabney—who was later on the staff of General "Stonewall" Jackson—discuss vividly a wide range of topics from the evils of church organs and whiskey drinking to the merits of slavery. But anti-slavery sentiment was strong in this part of Virginia. As was customary, slaves worshipped in the church gallery. Until the outbreak of the Civil War, the people of Augusta County desired to maintain the Union, but with the coming of war supported their state. The pastor was a chaplain in the Confederate Army, and a later pastor had been taken prisoner at the battle of Gettysburg. One of the last battles of the Civil War was fought nearby. The story of this congregation's life is carried on—more briefly—to mid-twentieth century.

If the local history cannot deal with the dominant forces of an era at their creative centers, it can illustrate them graphically at the grass roots level, and this the present study does with admirable grace. The author, who was pastor at the time of writing, and Professor Ernest Trice Thompson of Union Seminary in Virginia, who "piloted the whole undertaking," deserve commendation for an arduous task well done.

LEFFERTS A. LOETSCHER
Princeton Theological Seminary

The Life of the Right Reverend, the Honourable Charles James Stewart. THOMAS R. MILLMAN. London, Ontario. Huron College, 1953. xiv, 237 pp.

With this book Dr. Millman has

given us a worthy successor to his first book, *Jacob Mountain, First Lord Bishop of Quebec*. This book, which tells the story of Charles Stewart, who succeeded Jacob Mountain as bishop of Quebec, continues the history of the Church of England in Upper and Lower Canada. Not only will Anglicans welcome this book for the picture it gives of the frontier missionary work of their church, but Canadian historians in general will welcome it for the whole picture it gives of religious, social and political life in the Canadas.

Charles Stewart was the third son of the seventh Earl of Galloway, and as such enjoyed all the privileges of that heritage. He had the added advantage, denied to some in his class, of a father who "was a most warm and able admirer and supporter of the Christian religion; constant and zealous in the duties of public and private devotions; and happy in availing himself of every opportunity of openly, as well as in secret, setting forth his Redeemer and Saviour." An added influence in Stewart's early life was his tutor, who was the son of one of George Whitefield's converts. One wishes that Dr. Millman had been able to find material with which to give a fuller account of the family's religious background so that we might know more of the influences which moulded Charles Stewart's faith, but Dr. Millman is forced to record that, "of the motives which led Stewart to enter the ministry of the church no record remains."

After one short chapter devoted to the background and early life of Stewart, including his education at Oxford, Dr. Millman devotes the major part of his book to the story of Stewart's life and work in Canada. A number of illustrations and maps add to the value of the book, while five appendices which include, among other things, a list of Stewart's printed works give added value. One item of especial value is a section entitled "Biographies" in which Dr. Millman has given outlines of the careers of the clergy who served in the diocese during Stewart's episcopate.

Stewart began his work in Canada as

a missionary in that area of Quebec known as the Eastern Townships. He built churches and extended the bounds of the parish and did an admirable piece of work as minister in the area. This work occupied him during the years 1807-1821. In 1821 the scope of his work was increased and he became a travelling missionary ranging as far west as Sandwich on the Detroit River, and as far north as Hull on the Ottawa River. He not only carried on his religious duties with zeal and persistence, but took a lively interest in the life of his people. Dr. Millman gives an interesting account of Stewart's activities during the War of 1812; an account which incidentally gives us a picture of the problems war brought to the frontier area in which he served as minister.

After the sudden death of Bishop Mountain, Stewart found himself appointed bishop of Quebec in 1825. This was a period when the colonial church was still controlled from England, where the appointment was made, and where Stewart was consecrated. An interesting side-light on the way in which men were chosen for high posts in the colonial church is provided by a letter of Bishop Mountain's written in 1807:

If His Majesty should be pleased to admit my pretensions [for translation to an English diocese], a favourable appointment appears now to present itself for providing a successor in the See of Quebec in the person of the hon'ble Charles Stewart, a brother of Lord Galloway, who is actually soon going out to Canada to take a situation there as a private clergyman.

Perhaps fortunately for the church in Canada Stewart had eighteen years experience in Canada before the day came when he was appointed second bishop of Quebec.

As Bishop of Quebec, Stewart played his part in the political as well as the religious life of his adopted country, and Dr. Millman gives us a clear picture of the way in which religion and politics were intertwined during this period as the British government tried to maintain the Church of England as a favoured and established church within the colonies. Stewart

was an indefatigable worker, seeking first of all to serve the best interests of his church because he sincerely believed that in that way he best served the people, the country and his faith. His episcopate is marked by the expansion of the church and increased missionary activity, and an untiring interest in the welfare of his clergy. Perhaps the best commentary on his life and work was made by an old friend, one of his clergy, after his death:

... No man ever employed the talents which God had given him with greater zeal, always under the direction of reason, prudence, kindness and charity, than the late Bishop Stewart. I am an old man, at the age of 70, and I am afraid that I have not faith enough to believe that I shall ever see his like again.

If this reviewer had only one criticism to make of this book it would be this: in picturing the multifarious activities of the missionary and the administrator, Dr. Millman has unhappily been unable to draw for us such a picture of Stewart's personal life as to make us understand fully the words of this old friend. Dr. Millman has done a marvellous job of portraying the missionary at St. Armand, the travelling missionary, and the bishop, but for this reviewer at least he has failed to give a picture of the man his old friend spoke of.

Dr. Millman has given us an excellent account of Stewart's life and work, and in so doing has put us in his debt for the wide picture he has given us of life in Canada 125 years ago. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that Dr. Millman will continue to record the growth of the Church of England in Canada for us; and that his works will inspire others to do the same thing for the great leaders of other Canadian churches.

I commend this book to everyone who wishes to learn the story of the growth of Anglicanism in Canada, and also to those who are interested in the history of Canada in the period Dr. Millman has covered.

GORDON BARKWELL

*Trinity Congregation,
Chapleau, Ontario*

The Anglican Church in New Jersey.
By NELSON R. BURR. Philadelphia:
The Church Historical Society, 1954.
pp. xvi-768. \$10.00.

This is an example of regional history at its best and sets a pattern for the kind of cooperation necessary for the writing of respectable local history—a skillful historiographer collecting and organizing stores of sources, and placing them at the disposal of a trained historian. In the words of the author, both he and the editor, who is also the historiographer, have refused to set the Church with its ministers and people upon a pedestal of perfection, and records the losses, failures and weaknesses as well as their courage and successes. And this is as it should be.

New Jersey has a peculiar significance in the history of colonial Anglicanism. New Jersey was, in fact, the first Quaker colony, held by a number of Quaker proprietors, among them William Penn. And it was during the Quaker period (1685-1702) that New Jersey attracted a cross section of the religious groups which had found rootage in the middle colonies, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Dutch Reformed, Baptists, besides Quakers and Anglicans. Indeed for a time the Burlington New Jersey Monthly meeting was the largest Quaker center in the colonies. The Anglican importance of New Jersey dates from the founding of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel—the S. P. G.—in 1701, and the coming of George Keith, ex-Scotch Presbyterian, ex-Quaker, but now a flaming Anglican, as the advance agent of the Society to the Colonies, together with John Talbot, the ship's chaplain, whom Keith had converted to the cause of Anglican missions on the voyage over. Talbot became the first settled Anglican minister in New Jersey, organized St. Mary's Church in Burlington, where he remained until 1724. As the author states, Keith and Talbot found Anglicanism a mere "sentiment" in New Jersey, and left it with one established parish and ten other parishes in the making.

The New Jersey phase of the great eighteenth century Awakening is rightly placed in its inter-colonial setting, and is factually accurate, but the treatment is entirely unsympathetic. The New Jersey Anglican clergy were particularly critical of George Whitefield and his "religious passion" and the official Church attitude "hardened into fixed hostility." Eighteenth century Anglicanism, whether British or colonial, was constitutionally unable to appreciate and utilize the type of contribution Whitefield was undoubtedly making in revitalizing religion in the eighteenth century on both sides of the Atlantic.

The outstanding figure in New Jersey colonial Anglicanism was Thomas Bradbury Chandler, an ex-New England Congregationalist and a graduate of Yale College. At Yale College he had come under the influence of the strong Anglican influence which had persisted there since 1722. He was appointed the S.P.G. missionary at Elizabethtown in 1751, where he remained until the outbreak of the Revolution. A strong advocate of the Loyalist cause, he fled to England in 1775, where he remained for ten years. He was the leading advocate of an American bishop. Another notable New Jersey Anglican was Jonathan Odell, a graduate of the College of New Jersey, and a grandson of Jonathan Dickinson, the first president of the college. After serving for a time in the British Navy as a surgeon, he left the Navy to take Anglican orders and was serving the Anglican Church in Burlington at the opening of the Revolution. Passionately espousing the British cause, he became a trusted agent in numerous underground plots, and served as the go-between to Benedict Arnold and Major André. A clever rhymester, Odell wrote numerous poetical characterizations of patriot leaders, among them President Witherspoon of the College of New Jersey, of which the following are the closing lines:

I've known him seek the dungeon, dark
as night,
Imprison'd Tories to convert or fright;
While to myself I've hummed in dismal
tune,
I'd rather be a dog than Witherspoon.

Quite in contrast to Chandler and Odell was Uzal Ogden, Jr. A native of New Jersey and without a formal education, Odell became a protégé of Chandler, and after ordination at the hands of the Bishop of London, returned to his native New Jersey and was the Church's apostle to western New Jersey. He remained at his post throughout the Revolution and at the end of the war was the most influential Anglican clergyman in New Jersey. Following independence Ogden became "Methodistical," using extemporary prayer, and doubts of his loyalty were current. He was the first New Jersey bishop-elect, but was never consecrated. Later he left the Church and became a Presbyterian. In his later years he wrote the most elaborate refutation of Thomas Paine's *Age of Reason*.

The treatment throughout is largely biographical and consequently the narrative is fairly crowded with names. An Appendix of nearly a hundred pages contains short biographies of each of the forty-eight clergymen who served in New Jersey during the Colonial period. Of the eighteen chapters in the volume, sixteen deal with the colonial period, while the period since 1781 is covered in two chapters of moderate length. Indeed the book may be characterized as a collection of sources rather than a narrative history. There is an elaborate bibliography of twenty-four pages, forty-four pages of Notes and a twenty page Index.

WILLIAM WARREN SWEET

Dallas, Texas.

The Protestant Clergy and Public Issues, 1812-1848. By JOHN R. BODO. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954. xiv + 291 pages. Bibliography, Index. \$5.00.

The title of this work constitutes a major road-block on the author's road to clarity, making it necessary for him to devote most of the Preface to clearing it away by explaining that the words in it do not mean what they commonly mean and really have little relation to the contents of the book.

First "Protestant" is whittled down to exclude "on the one hand, the

Quakers, Unitarians, and Universalists, and on the other hand, the 'high church' Episcopalians." Then the Lutherans are cast out because "not yet in the mainstream of American life"—an interesting way of limiting the definition of "Protestant" which, by the way, collapses with the admission of S. S. Schmucker on page 258 to the company of "theocrats." Finally it is revealed that "our use of 'Protestant' is identical with *Calvinistic*." But what "Calvinistic" means—even in italics—is not so clear either, for "an exception was made for the Methodists, whose doctrinal divergence on the matter of Arminianism did not seem materially to affect our investigations!"

The next word is "clergy," which is said to be restricted to "a self-conscious social group, that is, to ministers and Christian leaders with a college and seminary education or its equivalent." Overlooking the intimation that only those with college and seminary education could constitute a self-conscious social group, and bypassing (as does the author) the method used to assess "its equivalent" (which might interest a great many seminary registrars and ordaining councils), this limitation conveniently disposes of "thousands of uneducated frontier preachers and revivalists, mostly Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterian schismatics." But this, we are told, does not matter because their "views, if at all accessible in print, would be 'frontier' views rather than 'clerical' views in the more professional sense of the term." Numerous "Turnerites," who have long been on the alert for just such material, may regret that the author does not give just a few examples of strictly "frontier" views. Instead he adds that "the educated elements in the Baptist and Methodist denominations" were considered because, forsooth, their opinions "we found to be in substantial agreement with those of their Congregational, Presbyterian, and 'low church' Episcopalian colleagues." Here is implied an intriguing definition of "educated" which suggests that a Methodist or Baptist minister was "educated" insofar as he agreed with

Congregational, Presbyterian, and/or some Episcopalian "clergymen."

Finally it is held that "clergy" inevitably has a "geographical restriction," a view which Freeborn Garrettson chided Lyman Beecher for holding in 1816. Hence, with all the aplomb of Humpty Dumpty ("When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean . . .") it is explained that

Clergyman, according to our definition, were found predominantly in the northern and middle states, or tended to represent the point of view of this area. . . . In short, the *American Protestant clergy* comprises, with some exceptions, the educated ministry of New England and the middle states, whose theology was largely Calvinistic.

Apparently the readers for the Princeton University Press would miss the humor of the Reverend Mr. Thwackum's approach:

When I mention religion I mean the Christian religion; and not only the Christian religion, but the Protestant religion; and not only the Protestant religion, but the Church of England.

It is obvious that it would have been somewhat simpler to say forthrightly that "American Protestant clergy" as used in the title, designates those ministers who held the constellation of ideas the author was looking for. This, of course, would not answer the question of why the phrase was dragged into the title in the first place, but most readers would not be inclined to underestimate the fascination that a supposedly interest-catching title has for both authors and publishers—especially the latter. Perhaps, then

if you must know

The Printer would needs have it so.

The constellation of ideas in question is aptly called throughout the nine chapters "the theocratic pattern," and those who held them are called "theocrats"—for having disposed of the title of the book in the Preface with a "Shandyism" that might well make Tristram himself envious, the author hardly refers to it again.

In brief, although the title does not indicate it, this is a study of the "theocratic pattern" of thinking in America during the first half of the nineteenth century.

This is a most timely and fruitful subject.

But there is bound to be some difference of opinion as to whether any definable group of individuals during this period are properly called "theocrats," or that any definable constellation of ideas is properly called "theocratic." Hence the significance of the whole study hinges, in effect, upon the clarity of the definition given what the author calls the "theocratic pattern."

He suggests (e.g., p. 9), that its "underlying structure" was (1) "Biblical legalism, drawn largely from the Old Testament, whence it derived the assurance of God's concern with nations as nations"; (2) "belief in the election of the United States as God's new Israel"; and (3) "the resulting sense of duty to make the United States conform to God's law and to her own God-given destiny." This summary statement is perhaps an undue complication of a two-fold definition suggested on page 5: (1) "The principle of God's direct rule of nations by means of a 'code of laws' contained in the Bible," and (2) the idea of America's "special calling."

This combination of ideological and practical elements constitutes a very cumbersome definition to apply, and the discussion of representative men to be included in the opposition (pp. 23-30), alone amounts practically to a demonstration of the impossibility of using it in any meaningful historical interpretation. For example, included are such diverse characters as Channing, Campbell, Garrison, Daniel and Theodore Parker, Adin Ballou (p. 26). But the author notes that "some of them, like the historian Bancroft, were even convinced of the historical mission of the United States," and Garrison, of course, was prominent in the "theocratic" Anti-Slavery Society. In brief, the definitions of the "theocratic pattern" and of the "opposition" become Procrustean beds upon which (as one small but typical example) the Unitarians are tortured into "rejecting the orthodox view of the Bible" (pp. 23-24)—a statement which erases all distinctions between Andrews Norton

and Theodore Parker, between Henry Ware, Sr., and Emerson.

Finally, when all this is said, it must be added that the work obviously indicates a great amount of competent research into sources and a high degree of technical skill in handling the materials. Following the introductory chapter on "The Theocratic Pattern in the Making," are chapters on the theocrats and the state, the catholic problem, the Indian problem, the Negro problem, "other social problems" (the inevitable "everything else" chapter), territorial expansion, and "America's world role." These chapters, including as they do some wonderfully apt quotations, light up whole areas of the life and thinking of the time—especially since, in keeping with one view of historiography, the principle of selection to determine what is included in each chapter seems to be roughly the same as that used in compiling Bartlett's famous book of quotations. And herein, I think, lies the real value of this book, from which one can learn a great deal about the mind of the first half of our nineteenth century.

SIDNEY E. MEAD
University of Chicago

Freedom Moves West: a History of the Western Unitarian Conference, 1852-1952. By CHARLES H. LYTTLE. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1952. Pp. xx, 298. \$3.75.

Western Unitarianism has long had a flavor of its own. In New England, the movement began in old, established churches, with members whose position in the community was secure. In the West, churches had to be founded, and their members usually found themselves in the position of a sectarian minority in the community. Hence Unitarianism attracted a considerable number of "come-outers," whose spiritual quest left them less concerned than their eastern cousins to emphasize the rootage of Unitarianism in the Christian tradition. While the differences between New England and the West are differences of emphasis more than of substance, they do exist; and they justify Professor Lyttle's separate treatment of western Unitarianism.

Yet the story Professor Lyttle tells is not narrowly geographic in its implications. He does supply factual information about the churches and ministers of the Western Conference. But the real theme of the book is the tension between those who have insisted on Christian theism as an essential part of Unitarianism, and those who have asserted that religion is more inclusive than theism or Christianity. This tension has existed within American Unitarianism for over a century, enlivening the affairs of the denomination in each successive generation. In 1838, Emerson's Divinity School Address stirred the fires of controversy; in 1865, it was the debate over the Preamble of the National Conference of Unitarian Churches; while since the 1920's, the Humanist-Theist argument has seemed like an old, familiar story. Each generation has produced its Transcendental movement, or its Free Religious Association, or its Humanist Association, which have seemed to threaten schism; but each generation has seen its rebels reabsorbed into the ongoing tradition without schism. The tension itself, and the method of resolution of tension, have survived for so

long that they now seem to be durable parts of the Unitarian tradition. Of this aspect of the life of the denomination, Professor Lyttle's book is the fullest account in print.

It is also the fullest account now available—even with its western focus—of American Unitarianism since the Civil War. Earl Morse Wilbur's second volume ends at 1900, and the period from 1865 to 1900 is treated in one chapter. Professor Lyttle's book reminds us that the denomination's significant history did not end with Transcendentalism. While none of the men he discusses is likely ever to attract the attention of scholars to the extent that Channing, Emerson, and Parker have, he has done well to revive the memories of men like Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

As the period since the Civil War is increasingly studied by historians of religion in America, this book will be prized, both for its own very real achievement, and for the basis it offers for further research in a variety of directions.

CONRAD WRIGHT

Harvard Divinity School

at
s
n
e
-
e
l
-
n

r
f
e
al
s
i-

T